

THE  
EVANGELICAL  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LXXX.

OCTOBER, 1869.

ARTICLE I.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. ARTICLE FOURTH OF THE  
AUGSBURG CONFESSION.\*

By MILTON VALENTINE, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.

The Fourth Article of the Confession, now before us for discussion, brings us into the very heart of the great work of the Reformation. More than any other, it is the memorial Article of that sublime movement. It was for the Evangelical doctrine of Justification by Faith, as apprehended in the depths of Luther's experience, that the struggle was begun. When the conflict was ended, and the pure Gospel restored, this Article in the Confession of the regenerated and living Church, stood as the firm monumental column of the victory. It presents the central doctrine, about which the other articles took shape in clear harmony with each other, and in the living unity of the Gos-

\* Fourth Lecture on the *Holman Foundation*, delivered June 28th, 1869, before the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Pa.

pel system. Not only for this truth, but in a peculiar manner by it, was the great work wrought. Set forth in its purity and power, it became the open channel through which the life-currents of Christ's grace came again into a reviving Church. No truth from the armory of the divine word became so distinctively "the sword of the Spirit" in the conflict. D'Aubigne's statement is apt and beautiful: "The powerful text, 'The just shall live by faith' was a creative word for the Reformer and the Reformation." We cannot overestimate the historical and theological importance of the Article before us. Had our noble Confessors been asked to name the special doctrine for whose recovery and restoration into the midst of the Christian system they were striving even unto blood, they would have pointed to this. Indeed, Melancthon did, in the very conflict, at Augsburg, thus single out and exalt this as "the principal and most important Article of the whole Christian doctrine."\* Luther put it on the banner of the Reformation as the doctrine with which the Church must stand or fall. History has fully recognized this importance by not only characterizing it, as the "material principle of the Reformation," but as the distinguishing fundamental doctrine of Protestantism.

Like the doctrine of the atonement, in close relation to which the truth of this Article stands, the doctrine of justification is one of pure revelation, and in its examination our appeal must necessarily be to the word of God. The suggestions of reason, and the dogmas of ecclesiastical authority must all be held subject to its divine decisions. Thus we retain as inseparably joined with this "material principle of the Reformation," the sole authority of the Holy Scriptures, recognized with equal historic clearness as its grand "formal principle."

The general analysis of the Article is easy. It has been so framed as to present the whole doctrine of justification under its negative and positive aspects, the former as renouncing the errors which had obtained destructive sway in the Romish Church, and the latter as declaring the true doctrine of the blessed Gospel. We shall probably best accomplish our object, to set forth at once the teachings of our Church and the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, on this subject, by treating it under these two aspects, and

---

\* Apol. Art. IV, (II).

noting the historical and theological relations thus involved. The specific points in the confessional statement will thus be indicated, and covered in the discussion.

#### I. THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF SELF-JUSTIFICATION.

The language of the Article is clear and emphatic: *Our Churches teach that we cannot obtain forgiveness of sin and be justified before God, by our own strength, merits, or works.*" This, as the exhibition of the subject on its negative side, sets forth a truth that is fundamental in Christian doctrine. The Confessors could not have maintained the integrity of the Gospel system of grace, without this denial of a self-wrought righteousness.

1. The pressing necessity for it, at the time, was to witness against the false teaching of Rome. Her corruption of the doctrine of Justification had been the point of the introduction of almost all the deadly errors that were holding sway over souls. Perversion of the truth here became an inevitable perversion of many of the most vital and practical forces of Christianity. It was, like an obscuration of the sun, the shrouding of everything in darkness. The heavy shadows of mediæval history, and the deep paralysis of the whole Church, bear painful testimony to the wide-spread consequences. The words of Luther on Gen. XXI, were verified in the sad experience: "This is the chief article of faith, and if it is taken away or corrupted, the Church cannot stand, nor can God retain his glory, which is that he may exercise mercy, and for the sake of his Son, forgive and save." The manifold cry that was going up to heaven for a reformation of the Church, arose from the hiding of the way of salvation in a perversion of this prime and vital doctrine. No correction of external abuses alone could heal her hurt, and restore her health and power. The remedial process must touch the deep point, whence all the disorders went forth. The error had hidden "the Way, the Truth, and the Life," from the view of perishing men. The false teaching of Rome was two-fold:

*First*, instead of exhibiting justification in its true nature as an external, forensic act of God, she represented it as subjective and internal. The error was one of long growth. Its rise may be traced back through a development of centuries. The germ of it was involved in the statement of Augustine: "*Justificat impium Deus, non sol-*

*um dimittendo, quae mala facit, sed etiam donando caritatem, quae declinat a malo et facit bonum per Spiritum Sanctum.*"\* The name and authority of Augustine, like a royal stamp on coin, gave currency to this representation. From his day the idea was developed, confounding justification with sanctification, and making it, not an objective divine act, but something subjective and transitive, constituting men internally and essentially righteous. It was regarded as a *making righteous*, by the communication of the Divine life in fellowship with Christ. Perhaps, in its earlier announcement, this view was meant to guard against the tendency to rely on a merely nominal faith, and to hold saving faith in its undivorced connection with the new life of grace. Without a divine vitality in union with faith, Christianity would lose its transforming and up-lifting power. But unfortunately, instead of showing the necessary relation of regeneration and sanctification to the faith in which God's justification of the sinner is conditioned, it introduced a confusion of thought and expression, in which the objective Divine act, and the subjective attending change, were confounded and identified. Most of the prominent Schoolmen made justification consist in the subjective character of the believer, as constituted intrinsically holy in the effectual operation of faith. The product of grace in the soul was made its basis and condition. By Thomas Aquinas it was represented as involving an infusion of the divine life, *infusio gratiae*. "*Justificatio primo ac proprie dicitur factio justitiae, secundario vero et quasi improprie potest dici justificatio significatio justitiae, vel dispositio ad justitiam. Sed si loquamur de justificatione proprie dicta, justitia potest accipi prout est in habitu, vel prout est in actu. Et secundum hoc justificatio dupliciter dicitur, uno quidem modo, secundum quod homo fit justus adipiscens habitum justitiae, alio vero modo, secundum quod opera justitiae operatur, ut secundum hoc justificatio nihil aliud sit quam justitiae executio. Justitia autem, sicut et aliae virtutes, potest accipi et acquisita, et infusa. \* \* Acquisita quidem causatur ex operibus, sed infusa causatur ab ipso Deo per ejus gratiam.*"\* This *infusio gratiae* was necessary to the forgiveness of sin by God. Though some, by deeper experiences of grace, clearer recognition of the witness of their Christian consciousness,

\* Opus Cont. Jnl. II. Ch. 163.

\* Summ. P. II. 1. Quoted by Hagenbach.



and better insight into Scripture teaching, were led to more objective views, *their* truer sentiments were so feebly sustained as to make no impression on the settled opinion. So that the decision of the Council of Trent may be regarded as setting forth the doctrine of the times on this point: "Justification is not remission of sins merely, but also sanctification and the renewal of the inner man by the voluntary reception of grace and divine gifts, so that he who was unrighteous is made righteous, and the enemy becomes a friend, and an heir according to the hope of eternal life."\* According to this, Justification becomes the renewal and transformation of the believer's nature. It is a transitive process making him really and internally righteous. The vigorous vindication of this doctrine by Bellarmin, *De Justif.*, demonstrates the strength with which the error had laid hold of the mind of the age.

This view involves, as necessary sequence, the existence of *degrees* of Justification, according to the extent of the Divine operation within the believer. Made to consist in a subjective holiness, of varied development but always imperfect, no certain assurance of forgiveness, and acceptance with God could be enjoyed. For the evidence of his justification, the Christian had to look within himself, and measure it in the degree, in which he had been made really righteous. He had to base his assurance of hope, not on the objective perfect righteousness and work of Christ, but on a righteousness wrought in partial measure by the Divine operation in his heart. What might be the minimum of infused righteousness necessary for Justification, could not be known. No one could settle the point of a sure grade of self-worthiness for acceptance before an infinitely holy God. Hence it was taught that no one could, without a particular revelation, be assured of his salvation. No wonder that Luther could find no peace for his stricken soul, till a truer view of Justification shed the Divine light on his mind. No wonder that the Reformers so emphatically declare that the doctrine of Rome could give no relief and comfort to the sin-burdened conscience.† *As*

\* "*Justificatio non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntarium susceptionem gratiae et donorum, unde homo ex injusto fit justus ex inimico amicus, ut sit haeres secundum spem vitae aeternae.* Conc. Trid. Sess. 6. Cap. 7.

† Apol. Art. IV. (II).

long as men are directed to look only on the righteousness that is personal, and inherent in them, at the very best defective, and coupled with vile and condemning sin, it is impossible to find a reliable consolation and rest. The unhappy error stands in the boldest, and most self-rebuking contrast with the declaration of St. Paul, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 5 : 1.

The second element in the false teaching of Rome was the inclusion of good works in the ground of justification. Those were represented and looked upon as meritorious, and, at least, in part, influential in securing the sinner's acceptance. It is but just, however, to say that Rome did not mean to be understood as wholly and absolutely excluding the work of Christ from the foundation of the sinner's justification. In a certain sense there was a recognition of indebtedness to his redeeming grace for it. But the conception of Christ's relation to it was so confused and overloaded with qualifying explanations as to present, practically and really, a doctrine of justification by human works and merit. A certain ability to perform acceptable works without grace was claimed for man. And though grace was regarded as influential in engrafting the sinner's nature into the sources of the divine life, both in the earlier and later stages of the work there was an inclusion of the idea of worthiness and merit. The very products of grace, in the progressive justification which was based on intrinsic and growing holiness, were viewed as deserving, and justly securing the favor of God. The human good work was represented as acting in conjunction with the merit of Christ, in attaining justification before God. Melancthon's declaration in the Apology expresses the result : "When the scholastics attempt to define how man is justified before God, they teach only the righteousness and piety of a correct external deportment before the world, and of good works, and in addition devise the dream that human reason is able, without the aid of the Holy Spirit, to love God above all things." "In this manner our adversaries have taught that men merit the remission of sins."\* The subtle distinction between *meritum de congruo*, and *meritum de condigno*, originated by Thomas Aquinas, and employed by Romish theologians

---

\* Apol. Art. IV. (II).

in explanation of their doctrine, does not save its character. For although Christ alone was represented as having originally and in Himself a *meritum condigni*, yet a *meritum congrui* was claimed as attainable by the sinner prior to grace, and then the *meritum condigni* was connected with all his good works. Before his conversion, and independently of the *primam gratiam* or *habitus*, of which they sometimes spoke as gained for him by Christ, he could perform good works which formed this merit of congruity rendering it meet, proper, equitable and necessary for God to reward with grace. The Apology presents the idea clearly: "They maintain that the Lord God must of necessity give grace unto those who do such good works; not, indeed, that he is compelled, but because this is the order, which God will not transgress or alter." Through this kind of merit he was supposed to attain the *habitus* or quickened disposition and inclination to love God. Then by love, patience, zeal, and good works, he attained the merit of congruity which could claim a recompence and eternal life on the score of desert and justice. "The Papists," writes *Luther*, on Gal. 2 : 16, "say, that a good work before grace is able to obtain grace of congruity (which they call *meritum de congruo*,) because it is meet that God should reward such a work. But when grace is obtained, the work following deserveth everlasting life of due debt and worthiness, which they call *meritum de condigno*." Besides this, it must be remembered, that they taught that Christ made satisfaction in his obedience and death only for original sin, leaving actual sins to be covered by the believer's penances and good works, denying at the same time, that the Redeemer by His work and sufferings has secured any such righteousness as may be imputed to the sinner and justify him in the sight of God.\* The Gospel of grace was thus thoroughly overthrown in a more than semi-Pelagian scheme of Justification by human strength and good works. The merit of Christ was displaced from its sacred position as the only and sufficient ground of the sinner's acceptance, and the way of grace was no more grace.

The following admirable summary of these aspects of the false teachings of Rome, is drawn from a Treatise, "*De Justitia Inhaerente, contra Pontificios*," by John Peter Ko-

---

\* See *Gerhard Loci*, Vol. VII. Cap. II.

now, Wittenberg, 1687.\* "In the first place the Papists teach that an adult, while yet unrenewed, can, by the natural powers of his free will, with the aid of inciting and assisting grace, perform some spiritually good works. Not only is he able, but if he desires to be justified, he is obliged to perform acts of faith, fear, hope, love, penitence, reception of the provided sacraments, of new life and obedience to the commands of God. Just as in natural changes, certain dispositions must precede, by which the subject is prepared to receive the new form, so in Justification, man who is to undergo a spiritual change, must dispose and prepare himself for the attainment of righteousness."

---

\* Principio igitur supponunt Pontificii, hominem adultum, nondum renatum, ex naturalibus liberi arbitrii veribus, auxiliante gratia excitati, moti, adjutique, actus quosdam edere posse, spiritualiter bonos. Nec solum posse sed etiam, si justificari cupiat, debere edere actum fidei, timoris, spei, dilectionis, poenitentiae, propositi suscipiendi sacramenta, et novae vitae, atque observationis mandatorium Dei. Quomodo enim in omnibus mutationibus, necesse est, quasdam praecedere dispositiones, quibus subjectum praeparatur ad recipiendam formam: ita hominem, in justificatione, modo quodam spirituali mutandum, actibus memoratis, se ipsum oportere disponere, ac praeparare, ad consequendam justitiam.

Ac fide quidem, ex auditu concepta, liberè moveri in Deum, credendo vera esse, quae ab ipso revelata, atque promissa sunt; praesertim justificari impium illius gratia, per redemptionem, quae est in Christo Jesu. Ipsamque fidem hanc, esse initium justificationes, et primam quasi radicem, quae fores quodammodo timori, spei, caritati, caeterisque dispositionibus aperiatur, aequae necessariae, sola minimè sufficiat. \* \* \* Porro quamlibet praedictarum dispositionum, ideoque et fidem, primam illam in ordine, non solum se tenere ex parte materiae, vel subjecti dispositi, verum, etiam ex parte agentis: non in genere organicæ, apprehendentis meritum Christi, sed meritoriae proprio actu Justificationem impetrantis, et promerentis. Non equidem de condigno, ex justitia, intrinsecaeque bonitate; sed ex acceptatione Dei, et congruentia quadam, ac honestate.

Jam ex quo homo ad eum modum sese disposuit, praeparavitque, Deum, remisso, hoc est, ut illi explicant, expulso peccato; ei dicunt infundere justitiae habitum, quo formaliter justus reddatur, est ad vitam aeternam acceptetur. Non unum, ac simplicem, sed fidei, spei, caritatis, patientiae, similesque plures habitus complectem. \* \* \* Etenim Justificatio Pontificiis in Primam Secundamque dividitur.

They represent also that, through faith, which comes by hearing, man is freely moved toward God, by believing those things which have been revealed and promised by Him, especially that the sinner is justified through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. This faith is itself the beginning, and, as it were, the first root of justification, which in a manner opens the way for fear, hope, love, and other equally needful dispositions: this alone, is by no means sufficient. \* \* \* They teach further, that these dispositions, among which faith is the first in order, are not merely results wrought in a passive subject, but belong to his active agency; not in the way of an instrumental cause, apprehending the merits of Christ, but as a meritorious cause, by its own proper act obtaining and deserving justification; not, indeed, *de condigno*, on the ground of justice and intrinsic goodness, but as acceptable to God, and fitting and honorable.

Now, after man has prepared himself in this way, they say that with the remission, that is, as they explain, the expulsion of sin, God infuses into him a principle, (*habitus*) of righteousness, by which he is formally rendered righteous and accepted for eternal life. This *habitus* is not single and simple, but embraces principles, (*habitus*) of faith, hope, charity and repentance. \* \* \*

For Justification is distinguished by the Papists into *first* and *second*. They call that the first, in which sinful man becomes righteous, through infused principles of faith, hope, love, patience, &c. They make that the *second*, by which the righteous man is made more righteous through works of righteousness, performed from the infused princi-

---

Primum vocant, qua homo ex impio fit justus, per infusos habitus, fidei, caritatis, patientiae, &c. Secundum appellant, qua homo justus, efficitur justior per opera justitiae ex infusus habitibus praestitis habituali justitiam conservantia, scientia, audentia, ac perscientia. Quare ad Primum illam opinantur sufficere habitum fidei, conjunctum cum caeteris infusae justitiae habitibus. Atque ita justificari primo infantes regentos, propria fide actuali carentes. Tum quoque adultos, qui post conversionem sui non supervivunt. Quanquam sub hac diversitate, ut infantes doceant justificari per solum habitum fidei, spei et caritatis, absque omni prava dispositione adultos autem per habitus eosdem, praecedentibus dispositionibus ex gratia praeveniente. Utroque sine operibus justitiae, ex infuso habitu praestitis: adultus non ab-

ples or inclinations, maintaining, nourishing, increasing and perfecting an habitual righteousness. For this *first* Justification they suppose the principle of faith, joined with the other infused principles of righteousness, sufficient. And so primarily regenerate infants, are justified, without any actual faith of their own. Thus, also, adults who do not continue to live after their conversion. With this difference, however, that infants are justified through the principle of faith, hope and love alone, without any previous disposition, but adults through these same principles, preceded by dispositions from prevenient grace. Both are justified without the works of righteousness, performed from the infused principle—adults not without preparatory acts which are also numbered among good works. In the *second* Justification, of adults who live after conversion and the remission of their sins, works of righteousness proceeding from the infused principles are also required; and these are properly meritorious, deserving not only an increase of habitual righteousness, but also, life and eternal salvation. \* \* \* \* But to state the whole doctrine in a few words, the Papists agree in representing the justification of man in the sight of God as threefold. *First*, inchoative, in inceptive dispositions in which a formal righteousness is begun: *Secondly*, Formally through an infused principle [*habitus*] of righteousness: *Thirdly*, meritoriously, through the exercise of the infused principle, or the works which follow that principle. All this righteousness of man thus justified in the way of inceptive dispositions, formally, and meritoriously, they call *inherent*; whether it exist as a quality, or an activity, and thus

---

sque actibus praeparatoriis, quos ipsos etiam in bonis operibus numerant. In secunda verò Justificatione, hominum adultorum, qui post sui conversionem, et obtentam remissionem peccatorum, tamdiu supervivunt, donec occasio implendae legis occurrat, et fidei, et caeterorum habituum infusorum ex exercitiis, vel opera justitiae exinfusis habitibus perfecta requirunt: eadem quae proprie meritoria, non tantum incrementi justitiae habitualis, sed etiam ipsius vitae, salutisque aeternae. \*

\* \* \* Ut rem in paucis contraham, censeat Pontificii hominem coram Deo justificari trifariam. Primò dispositivè, seu inchoativè, per dispositiones, quibus inchætur formalis justitia. Secundò formaliter, per infusum justitiae habitum. Tertiò meritoriè, per exercitia infusi habitus, seu opera, habitum illum consequentia, Omnemque illam justitiam hominis, dispositivè, formaliter, et meri-

subsisting in the man, just as an attribute belongs to the subject in which it inheres. On account of this diversity they also distinguish inherent righteousness as Habitual and Actual. Habitual righteousness they treat as a permanent rectitude, in the way of habits [*habitus*] or an infused principle out of which the rectitude of all the powers proceed, involving such spiritual affections in the believer that, whenever he will, he may with readiness, ease and delight, perform good works. To the Actual righteousness they refer, *first*, the person's dispositions of faith, fear, hope, and other acts in which they desire the Habitual righteousness to be begun. Then also, principally and specifically, they place Actual righteousness in the exercise of the Habitual righteousness, and declare it to be nothing else than the endeavor after good works by which the Christian maintains his justification, and by truly deserving it, secures for himself both an increase of righteousness, and eternal life and salvation." Cap. IV—X.

From this sad confounding of justification with sanctification in the doctrine of justification by an inherent righteousness, and the consequent belief in the meritoriousness of works, the way was open to the greatest absurdities and abuses. The deep poison of the error flowed out, in blighting power, through all the currents of the Church's life. It could not but be that practical piety, cut off from its sources of true vitality, should be perverted into multitudinous false and unseemly manifestations. The merit of work and ascetic self-culture became the very soul of the monastic seclusions, pilgrimages, penances, and the circle

torie justificati, Inhaerentem nominant : utpote vel per modum qualitatis habitam, vel actu exercitam, ideoque homini inexistentem, aicut accidens est in subjecto, cui inhaeret. Pro qua etiam varietate Inhaerentem justitiam in Habitualement et Actualement dispeſcunt. Ac Habitualement quidem ajunt, esse rectitudinem per manentem ad modum habitus vel habitum infusum, ex quo omnium potentiarum rectitudo proveniat : Homine ita affecto, ut quando velit, prompté, facile, et cum delectatione operari possit. Ad Actualement autem justitiam referunt primo dispositiones suas, fidei, timoris, spei, caeterosque actus, quibus inchoari volunt justitiam habitualement. Tum atque praecipue, specificque Actualement justitiam in exercitio Habitualement justitiae collocant, et nihil aliud esse tradunt, quam studium bonorum operum, quibus homo justificationem continuans, proprie merendo sibi et accessionem justitiae, et vitam salutemque aeternam acquirat.



of perverted and perverting will-worship, which at once deformed the christian life and disgraced the church of that day. From the doctrine of personal justification by works, the step was easy to the conclusion that special zeal and devotion might do more than enough to justify. Here was the natural entrance of the doctrine of supererogatory works. These were regarded as forming a treasury of accumulated merit, at the disposal of the Church. Though at first the merits of Christ were held mainly to constitute the Church's treasure,\* the doctrine was developed so as to refer almost exclusively to the superabounding merits of the saints.† Out of this false doctrine arose the monstrous system of indulgences, into which the gross darkness of mediæval christianity culminated. The confounding of Justification with regeneration and sanctification, and looking upon it as inherent, thus proved the direful source of nearly all the Church's woes. It presented in vivid reality the truth of Luther's words, "*Jacente articulo justificationis omnia jacent.*" Against an error so dishonoring to Christ and fruitful of evils, the Confessors felt called upon to bear emphatic and solemn testimony. Fidelity to the Redeemer, to His truth, and to imperiled and perishing souls, could not otherwise be maintained.

2. In this witnessing against Rome, they were taking a position sustained and demanded by the Holy Scriptures. Their renunciation of the Papal error was simply a clear statement of the emphatic teaching of the word of God. Recurrence to a few passages will suffice to show the harmony of the Confession with the Scriptures, and the solemn urgency, with which they guard against the idea of justification by our "own merit, strength, or works."

"The man that doeth them shall live by them," Gal. 3 : 12, is given as the rule of the "law of commandments." Perfect obedience is made the legal condition of acceptance before God. That this is impossible with man, is asserted in the harmonious voice of all the Scriptures. St.

\* Alexander Halesius, Summa P. IV, qn. Art. 2. *Indulgentiæ et relaxationes fiunt de meritis supererogationis membrorum Christi, et maxime de supererogationibus meritorum Christi, quæ sunt spiritualis thesaurus Ecclesiæ.*

† Albertus Magnus, Sent. Lib. IV. Dist. 20. Art. 16. *Indulgentia sive relaxatio est remissio poenæ injunctæ ex vi clavium et thesauro supererogationis perfectorum procedens.*

Paul, Rom. 3 : 9—10, declares, "We have proved both Jews and Gentiles under sin. \* \* There is none righteous, no, not one." "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law ; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," vs. 19, 23. From this condition of sin and condemnation, in which every man is by nature, there is declared to be no escape by his own strength, obedience, or works. "The law worketh wrath," Rom. 4 : 15. "Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight," Rom. 3 : 20. "That no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, is evident : for the just shall live by faith," Gal. 3 : 11. "If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness had been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin," Gal. 3 : 21, 22. All that the law can do with sinners is to condemn, and occasion the knowledge of sin. In the way of bringing men to salvation, this is declared to be its distinct and only office. No guilty soul can struggle back into the favor of God, by observance of its requisitions. It is "a schoolmaster" (*παιδαγωγός*, not an instructor, but a servant whose office it was to conduct children to and from the public schools,) to lead to *Christ*, as the only provided righteousness. In these and many other passages, reiterating this truth in multiplied forms and with earnest emphasis, the Reformers saw an absolute exclusion of the hope of salvation by human strength, or works. The sinner is left helpless and hopeless in himself. "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse," Gal. 5 : 10.

Not only in the general denial of justification by works, but in the particular repudiation of the idea of *merit*, were the Reformers but reasserting a fundamental truth of God's word. The whole notion of merit, in which the false theory of justification had been based by Rome, is opposed by the clear teaching of Scripture. The principle is laid down by our Saviour, "When ye have done all these things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants : we have done that which was our duty to do," Luke 17 : 20. The best fulfilment of the law, and the purest attainments of holiness do not go beyond duty, and are not regarded by God as earning any claim before him. Hence the unequivocal statement

which totally excludes the notion of merit, "Ye are saved by grace—not of works, lest any man should boast," Eph. 2 : 8, 9. "And if by grace, then it is no more of works : otherwise, grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace : otherwise, work is no more work." Rom. 11 : 6. Even the smallest share of merit is thus excluded from the observance of the law and the services of piety. Neither as supplementary to the work of Christ, nor in any combination with it, do the Scriptures tolerate a notion of human merit, in the foundation of the sinner's justification.

3. This teaching of the Divine word is fully sustained by the decisions of enlightened reason. In this, the truth is fortified with additional strength. It is true, that Reason is not to sit as a judge of the doctrines of revelation. Its concurring conclusions, however, aid in fixing our conviction of these doctrines. The truths of the word stand out in clearer demonstration and power, when they at once make answer for themselves to every man's intellect and conscience. This truth is of this kind. Our Confessors in throwing it into the bold foreground of their view of justification, were taking a position in which they could hear every voice from Scripture answered by consenting and confirmatory voices from the conscience and reason of mankind. The painful helplessness of our guilty race has ever been crying out, "Wherewith shall a man come before God, or bow himself before the Almighty?" Reason adjudges, that an unfallen and sinless being may be accepted before God on the principle, "He that doeth them shall live by them." An unbroken and perfect obedience by a holy being leaves no place for condemnation. But he that offends in a single point becomes a transgressor. And "there is no man that liveth and sinneth not." We must thus view our race, as it really is, under condemnation for original and actual sin. The question as it must come up before our reason, concerns the justification of *sinner*s, and the conclusion flows in rigid logical sequence from the premises. Sin, in its very nature, is a withholding from God what is His due. It involves opposition of the creature's will to Him, and refusal of the obedience and service which belong to Him. This withholding what is due to God becomes both a crime and a debt. Thus, not only the obedience withheld, but satisfaction for the crime, must be required of the sinner. He has not only fallen

into fatal arrears, but come under the penalty of a law and government on whose sacred inviolability the peace and order of a moral universe are hung. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," as the eternal law of God's holiness and love, announces the destruction into which the transgressor has brought himself. With his fallen nature, he is now able neither to keep the law nor to render satisfaction for its past violation. He cannot pay the debt. In his criminal inability, every effort to obey is defective; and vitiated by sin. Could he even start anew, and render thenceforth a perfect obedience, the past would remain without satisfaction. All a man's powers, his time, his talents, his skill and service, belong to God. There is not a moment in which he can feel released from the claims of God upon him, not a power of body, a faculty of mind, an endowment of energy, which is beyond the obligation of entire consecration to Him. And were he, as a creature, enabled thenceforth to give to God a perfect service, he would only be doing his present duty, and could have no surplus of time or powers to atone for the past and pay the dreadful debt. Thus, on both points, man must come fatally short. His works can no longer justify him. This part of our Article is, therefore, sustained by the clearest deductions of reason, as well as by the emphatic teachings of the word of God.

The deep and deadly error of Rome has thus been renounced. Faithful and true witness is borne against it. That doctrine maintaining the meritoriousness of good works, and teaching men to rely upon them for justification before God, was falsifying the Gospel, and laying another foundation, than that which is laid in Jesus Christ. "Thus these men conceal Christ from us," exclaims Melancthon, "and bury him anew, so that it is impossible for us to recognize him as a Mediator."\* It was the all-perverting error, in which centered the crying necessity of the Reformation.

## II. THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

A more concise, comprehensive and vigorous statement of the positive side of this great doctrine could scarcely be framed: "We obtain forgiveness of sins, and are justified before God, by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith, if

---

\* Apol. Art. IV.

we believe that Christ suffered for us, and that our sins are remitted unto us for Christ's sake, who made satisfaction for our transgressions by his death. This faith God imputes for righteousness before him, Rom. III and IV." This presents all the principal truths in the teaching of the Gospel on the subject. It calls our attention to the four great and all-inclusive points: I. *The Source of Justification*, "Grace," [*aus gnaden, gratis*]; 2. *The Ground of it*, "For Christ's sake," "Christ suffered for us"—"made satisfaction for our transgressions by his death;" 3. *The Nature of it*, "We obtain forgiveness of sins, righteousness and eternal life;" 4. *The instrument*, "Through Faith." An intelligent view of the teaching of our Confession will be obtained by looking at these points in their order.

#### I. *The Source.*

This is the grace of God, which, in the technical language of Theology is denominated the efficient cause, *causa efficiens*, of justification. "God forgives us our sins out of pure grace."\* "Justified freely by his grace," says St. Paul, Rom. 8 : 24. "God so loved the world that he gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life," John 3 : 16. It is needless to repeat the numerous texts which trace up our salvation to its source in the compassionate love and grace of God. They are varied and multiplied in rich profusion throughout the New Testament. Even faith though most vitally involved in our justification, is in no sense its source or efficient cause. "It is God that justifieth," Rom. 8 : 33, His own love having made the provision by which he can be just and yet thus justify the ungodly. Rom. 3 : 25 ; 4 : 5. The sense of the term grace, Heb. *ἡ χάρις*, Greek *χάρις*, as used in this connection, must be clearly distinguished. It expresses neither any divine act done for us, nor any quality or excellence wrought in us, but the mercy and benevolence of God toward us.† And this

\* Form of Concord, Art. III.

† Melancthon, Loci Theo. De Gratia : Facessant Aristotelica signimenta de qualitatibus. Non aliud enim est gratia si exactissime describenda sit, nisi Dei benevolentia erga nos, seu voluntas Dei miserta nostri. Non significat ergo gratiae vocabulum qualitatem aliquam in nobis ; sed potius ipsam Dei voluntatem seu benevolentiam Dei erga nos.

grace from which justification and salvation freely flow, must be referred to the one God, revealed as the Trinity in unity. "I, even, I, am the Lord; and besides me there is no Saviour," Is. 43 : 11. Whilst maintaining the order and distinction of the Persons in the Trinity, the Scriptures clearly refer to the whole Godhead, in pointing us to the primal source of the sinner's forgiveness and salvation. Hence our Justification is interchangeably ascribed to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. John 3 : 16; Gal. 2 : 20; Rom. 5 : 5; Col. 3 : 13; Is. 53 : 11; 1 Cor. 6 : 11. The connection of this fact, with the use of the names of the three Persons of the Trinity in the formula of Baptism, is obvious and suggestive.

## 2. The Ground of Justification.

This, known as the meritorious cause, *causa meritoria*, is the whole work of Jesus Christ, by which he has atoned for human sins, and brought in a complete and everlasting righteousness: "Justified freely by the grace of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God has set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," Rom. 3 : 24, 25. In this aggregate work of Christ, in which is laid the deep and secure foundation of our acceptance and salvation, there are three things to be considered :

1. It must be viewed as the work of the *Godman*. Both before and after the Reformation the question was agitated whether Christ is our righteousness, according to his Divine, or his human nature.\* The question was one which touched upon a deep and vital point of Christian doctrine, and the correct view becomes of great importance. The view that held to our justification by Christ's righteousness according to his Divine nature alone, confounded the true, essential, unchangeable righteousness of the Son of God, in his true, natural and essential divinity with that vicarious work which forms the meritorious righteousness pro-

\* Peter Lombardus, III Sent. Dist. 19. Christus mediator est in quantum homo, nam in quantum Deus non Mediator, sed aequalis est Patri.

*Busaeus*, Disp. de Persona Christi : Christus est mediator tantum secundum humanam naturam. Quoted from Gerh. Loci Theol. Loc. XVII, Cap. 2. See Osiandrian Controversy, in Ch. Hist.

vided in his obedience and death, and imputed to the sinner; whilst the view which held that Christ is our righteousness according to his human nature alone failed to include what is indispensable to the efficacy, value and perfection of his redeeming work. We can be justified only by Christ, as our righteousness, according to both natures.

It is necessary carefully to distinguish between the essential and immutable holiness of the Son of God, in his Divine nature, and that righteousness which He came and wrought out for our fallen race. The essential holiness of that nature must indeed be recognized as a necessary condition of his work for us, but it is different from it. Neither his human nature nor his Divine nature intrinsically, is the basis of our justification, but the work done, the life lived, the obedience maintained, the sufferings endured, for us, in the one Person of the Godman. The point is, that in looking for the ground of our justification, we are not to regard the intrinsic *character* of the Deity of Christ as imputed to us, but the "obedience unto death," which He in his sinless theanthropic person has provided as the basis of our pardon and acceptance. It is what he has done and furnished in the economy and work of redemption. Because of his sinless Divine holiness, He *could* become our righteousness, but he has actually become such *by* all that, in the unity of his Divine-human person, He has done to supply what we had *not* done, and to release us from the consequences of our sins. This *work* of the Son of God for us must be viewed as including his incarnation—the very act of his becoming Godman, in which He also becomes "our Righteousness." In other words, He became "*our* righteousness only in his becoming the Godman and the work then wrought, in the union of both natures, for us. In the Divine nature alone He could not have suffered and died, and without the communion of the Divine with the human in the unity of one person, the sufferings and obedience of Christ would have lacked the infinite merit, necessary to their atoning efficacy. Hence the Form of Concord states, with admirable clearness: "Christ is our righteousness, neither according to the Divine nature alone, nor yet according to the human nature alone, but the *whole Christ*, according to both natures, in or through that obedience alone which He, as God and man, rendered to the Father even unto death, and by which He has merited for us forgiveness of sins and eternal life. Epit. III. 1.



"In this manner neither the Divine, nor the human, nature of Christ by itself is imputed to us for righteousness, but the obedience of the Person alone, who is at the same time God and man." "Thus, too, the disputed point concerning the indwelling of the essential righteousness of God\* in us, must be rightly explained. For though God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who is the eternal and essential righteousness, dwells, through faith, in the elect, who are justified through Christ, and reconciled to God, (for all Christians are temples of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,) yet this indwelling of God is not that righteousness of faith, concerning which St. Paul speaks, and which he calls *justitia Dei*, that is, the righteousness of God, on account of which we are justified before God."†

2. It embraces Christ's *active obedience* for us. The whole of Christ's earthly work must be regarded as vicarious. To act in our stead, He was "made under the law." His incarnation, in which is seen the incipient act in his becoming "*our righteousness*," was preparatory not only to suffering for our sins, but to fulfilment of the law for us. An atonement, made by sacrificial death, releasing from an incurred penalty, is in itself not the full bringing in of a perfect righteousness by the imputation of which we will have all that we need. More than the negative condition of being simply pardoned, is necessary. We need to be looked upon, as if we were positively righteous. The obedience of Christ, in which the law was kept and honored, was an essential element in furnishing for us what the Law and holiness of God demanded of us. Where we were sinners, He, acting mediatorially in a vicarious life, was perfectly righteous. This sinless active obedience of the Godman, must be viewed not simply as a needful condition to an efficaciously atoning death, but as

---

\* This was the precise form of the error of Osiander, whose controversies distracted the Church for some years, prior to the Form of Concord. Misapplying some of Luther's expressions concerning the indwelling of Christ in the soul, through faith, he represented Christ as the righteousness of the believer by being in him. "Through the Word dwelling in us, we are justified." "The Gospel has two parts; the first, that Christ has satisfied the justice of God; the second, that he purifies and justifies us from sin, by dwelling in us." Quoted from Wieseler, Ch. Hist. IV. pp. 470—471.

† Form Con. Decl. III.

being in itself an essential part of that righteousness which is imputed to us. Before men could inherit the blessings promised to obedience, the Divine Substitute had to fulfil for them all its holy precepts. *Buddeus* has presented the truth clearly: "Christ did not only expiate our sins by his sufferings and death, but through his whole life most completely fulfilled the law in our stead. He thus made satisfaction for us, not only by a most precious sacrifice to offended Deity, but also by performing everything which the Divine justice, so infinitely offended by the sins of men, could demand. Thus all obligation to punishment ceased and was taken away, and God, being thus reconciled, is prepared to forgive all our sins, and to receive us into the number of his children, when we embrace the merits of Christ in true faith."\*

The inclusion of Christ's active obedience in the ground of justification is a point of great importance. From the earliest ages of the Christian Church much stress was laid on this part of his work. Though his death has always been recognized as the crown of his saving love, his work was represented as carried on through all the stages of his life. This truth is involved in the well-known passage in Irenæus, in which he speaks of Christ's advancing through infancy, youth, and manhood, saving all ages, by living and acting for all.† Both the perfect obedience of Christ, and the shedding of his blood as a ransom, unite in the system of Irenæus, but he seems to have held the idea of a sacrifice in the background. *Gregory of Nyssa*, mentions it, as an element in the work of redemption, that Christ maintained a pure disposition through all the moments of his life.‡ In the Scholastic age the active obe-

\* *Buddeus*, Inst. Theol. Dog. Lib. IV. Sec. 37. Non tantum Christus passione et morte sua nostra peccata expiavit, sed per totam vitam, legem divinam pro nobis accuratissime implevit; et ita pro nobis satisfacit, dum non tantum sacrificio infiniti valoris iratum Deum placavit, sed et ea omnia accurate præstitit, quæ justitia divina hominum peccatis infinitum in modum laesa, exigere poterat; adeo ut omnis obligatio ad poenam cesset, prorsusque sit sublata, Deus vero utpote hac ratione reconciliatus, omnia peccata, quæ admiserunt, modo vera fide meritum Christi apprehendant, illis remittere et condonare eosque in numerum filiorum suorum recipere paratus sit.

† Iren II. 224.

‡ Hagenbach, Hist. Doc. I. p. 380.

dience of Christ continued to hold a high place in theological representations of the Redeemer's vicarious work. So prominently did *Anselm* (A. D., 1093—1109,) make this, that in the history of doctrines it is made a question whether he did not altogether exclude the *Satisfactio passiva* from his view of Redemption.\*

Some modern theologians, however, exclude the active obedience of Christ from being, immediately and in itself, a part of the ground of justification. They admit that this obedience was indeed necessary, but only, as a condition pre-requisite to fit him to offer a pure and acceptable sacrifice. Had He himself sinned, his sufferings could not be regarded as vicarious and accruing to the benefit of others. They connect his active obedience, not with the provision of a righteousness for us, but with his qualification to furnish an effectual vicarious sacrifice. A just and full view of Christ's work, as the ground of our justification must pronounce this theory defective and inadequate. If the doctrine is correct, which presents the righteousness by which we are justified, as not the intrinsic holiness of the Saviour's divine nature, but the *work done by him in his theanthropic Person, on behalf of sinners*, it follows directly and necessarily, that we must regard him as not only furnishing a basis of pardon by his innocent sufferings, but a ground of acceptance by fulfilling for us all righteousness. Hence whilst the Confession is silent on this precise point, the authors of the Form of Concord, who have most sharply and correctly presented the full doctrine of this Article, have included the *Satisfactio activa* in varied and emphatic phrase. They ground justification on "*the entire obedience of the whole Christ.*" They mention both his "obedience," and his "bitter sufferings," as included. "Faith looks upon the person of Christ, as the same was made under the law for us, bore our sins, and when proceeding to the Father rendered entire and perfect obedience to his heavenly Father for us poor sinners, from his holy birth unto his death; and thereby covered all our disobedience which inheres in our nature, in its thoughts, words and deeds." Hence that righteousness, which is imputed to faith, or to believers, before God, through grace alone, is the obedience, the sufferings, and

\*See Neander, Hist. Dog. p. 517, and Hagenbach Hist. Doc. II. p. 38.

the resurrection of Christ, by which He has rendered complete satisfaction unto the law for us, and made expiation for our sins. For, since Christ is not only man, but God and man in one undivided person, He was as little subject to the law, being Lord of the law, as it would have been necessary for him to suffer and die for his own person.

*His obedience, therefore, not only in suffering and dying, but in his being voluntarily put under the law in our stead, and fulfilling it with such obedience, is imputed unto us for righteousness; so that, for the sake of this perfect obedience, which He rendered unto his heavenly Father for us, in both doing and suffering, in his life and death, God forgives us our sins, accounts us as righteous and just, and saves us eternally.\**

Scripture proof of the correctness of this view may be seen by a reference to a few passages. Rom. 5 : 19, St. Paul declares, "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of One, shall many be made righteous." The reference is admitted to be to the justification of the sinner through Christ. Were it based on his death alone, the use of the different and comprehensive term *obedience*, would be unaccountable. It may, and must, indeed, be regarded as including his "*obedience unto death*," or his suffering, but refers more directly to the aggregate work of satisfying the demands of the law. From the antithesis of the word to the disobedience of Adam, his active obedience, rather than his sufferings, seems to be the prominent idea.† "The entire holy life of our Saviour," says Tholuck, "is termed *ὑπακοή*, embracing in indivisible unity what the Church has termed the *obedientia activa*, and *obedientia passiva*." In loco. In v. 18, the apostle expresses the same idea in another form: "By the righteousness, *δικαιοσύνης*, of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification, *δικαίωσις*, of life." In this passage the term "*righteousness*," seems to be the equivalent of "*obedience*," in v. 19. They are alike connected with justification, and are terms of more comprehensive import than would have been used had the apostle nothing in his view but Christ's death. The same doctrine is implied in Ps. 40 : 8, compared with John 4 : 34.

8. It is completed in Christ's *passive obedience*. The Confession gives prominence to this because it presents the most central conception of the atonement. As the basis

---

\* Form Con. Dec. Art. III. † See Hodge in loco.

of justification it refers to the great unparalleled fact, "Christ suffered"—"made satisfaction for our transgressions by his death."

The most casual reading of the Scriptures is sufficient to impress every one with a conviction of the vital relation of Christ's sufferings and death with the sinner's salvation. Text follows text, and declaration is added to declaration, to keep Jesus before the sinner's view as "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world." The Old Testament points to this part of His mediatorial and saving work, in type and shadow, bleeding victims and smoking altars, temple arrangements and prophetic announcements. Isaiah directs to a suffering Saviour, stricken, smitten, making his soul an offering for sin, and justifying many because of bearing their iniquities. Daniel beholds him as cut off, but not for himself. In the New Testament we hear Christ himself declare, as He approaches the dreadful hour, "For this purpose I came unto this hour." And though his disciples at first could not understand this, and stumbled at it, after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, leading them into the truth, they were ready to exclaim, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of Christ." They resolved to know nothing among men but Christ, and him crucified, and preached this as the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation. It is made the ceaseless theme of the word of God.

The sufferings of the Redeemer have their relation to the punishment due our sins. As his life fulfilled all the requirements of the law in our stead, his agony and death satisfied all the penalty denounced upon our transgressions. "The wages of sin is death." But "when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly," Rom. 5 : 6. God "hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," 2 Cor. 5 : 21. "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many," Mat. 20 : 28. The Church is spoken of, as "the Church of God which He hath purchased with his own blood," Acts 20 : 28. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us," Eph. 2 : 13. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," Rom. 3 : 25. "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," 1

Cor. 15 : 3. "Christ, our passover is sacrificed for us," 1 Cor. 5 : 7. "God commendeth his love towards us in that while we were sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him," Rom. 5 : 8, 9. "We also joy in God, by whom we have now received the atonement," Rom. 5 : 11. "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, He entered once into the Holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," Heb. 9 : 12. "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many," Heb. 9 : 28. "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ," 1 Pet. 1 : 18, 19. "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree," 1 Pet. 2 : 24. These passages, and many others, illuminating all the pages of the New Testament with the light of redemption, set forth unequivocally, and with all the fervor of the Gospel message, that Christ, in the unity of his two natures in one Person, and acting in a vicarious character, bore the curse and punishment due to us, expiated all our offences, honored and satisfied the law, so that God might be just and yet pardon and accept the ungodly.

The reason why, since the fall, such vicarious obedience and suffering are necessary to the sinner's forgiveness and salvation, is found in the necessity of maintaining the inviolable sanctity of the Divine law and holiness. The wicked could not be justified on the simple ground of repentance and reformation. Repentance and reformation can have no atoning power over the past. It can neither satisfy the penalty of the broken law, nor vindicate the holiness and justice of God against the fearful crime of already committed sin. God must "declare his righteousness," as well as set forth his mercy. Thus the glorious message of salvation, does not come as a departure from justice, or any relaxation of its demands, but offers its gracious blessings through the substitutionary fulfilment of both the practical and penal requirements of the law, by which mercy and truth have met together, and unite in perfect harmony.\* "Once for all together, Christ has done

\* Augustine, Ps. 100. *Homines quando judicunt, aliquando vieti misericordia faciunt contra justitiam, et videtur in eis esse misericor-*

enough to remove the sins of all who come to him and believe on him." Luth. on 1 Pet. 3 : 18.

### 3. *The Nature of Justification.*

In the brief but clear terms of the Confession, amplified in the Apology and Form of Concord, the doctrine of the Gospel and of our Church on this point is most satisfactorily defined. Justification is mentioned as "the remission of sins," and the bestowal upon us of "righteousness and eternal life." The three essential elements of its nature are here involved :

1. Its judicial and objective character.\* In this, it contains a clear and absolute repudiation of the theory, which had been maintained, and still is, by Romish, and some Protestant theologians. Over against all the notion of justification by an inherent righteousness, confounding justification with sanctification, the Reformers rigorously asserted the objective and forensic nature of this act, as an essential distinction in sound and Biblical Theology. Although the language of Melancthon, in the Apology, is,

---

dia et non esse iudicium, aliquando vero rigidum volentes tenere iudicium, perdunt misericordiam. Deus autem nec in bonitate misericordiae perdit iudicii severitatem, nec in iudicando cum severitate amittit misericordiae bonitatem.

\* Chemnitz. Paulus articulum justificationis ubique describit tanquam processum iudiciale, quod conscientia peccatoris coram tribunali Dei lege divina accusata, convicta et sententiae aeternae damnationis subjecta, confugiens ad thronum gratiae restituitur, absolvitur et a sententia damnationis liberata, ad vitam aeternam acceptatur, propter damnationem et intercessionem filii Dei mediatoris, quae fide apprehenditur et applicatur.

Quenstedt, (III, 526). Justificatio est actus Sanctissimae Trinitatis externus, iudicialis, gratus, quo hominem peccatorem gratis propter Christi meritum fide apprehensum remissis peccatis, iustum reputat, in gloriosae gratiae ac iustitiae laudem et iustificatorum salutem.

Hollaz. Justificatio est actus iudicialis isque gratus, quo Deus satisfactione Christi reconciliatus peccatorem in Christum credentem, ab objectis criminibus absolvit et iustum aestimat atque declarat. Quae actio, cum sit extra hominem in Deo, non potest hominem inrinsce mutare.



in a few cases, ambiguous on this point, undoubtedly the whole tenor of it, and many distinct and definitive passages, set forth its nature as outward and judicial. And the Form of Concord declares, "If we wish to retain in its purity the Article concerning justification, great diligence and care are to be observed, lest that which precedes faith and that which follows it, be at the same time intermingled and introduced into the article concerning justification, as necessary and pertaining to it. For it is not one and the same thing to speak of conversion and justification." "For, though the converted and believing have an incipient renewal, sanctification, love, virtue, and good works, yet these cannot and must not be referred to the article of justification before God, and confounded with it; so that Christ the Redeemer may not be deprived of his glory, and troubled consciences may not, since our new obedience is still imperfect and impure, be robbed of their sure consolation."

The proof of the external and forensic, or perhaps, more properly, *governmental*, nature of justification, is made manifest by a reference to a few passages of the Word of God. It is involved in the use of the word *justify*. The Hebrew *צדק*, translated by the Seventy into the Greek words, *δικαιούν*, *δικαιοῦσθαι*, *δικαιον κρίνειν*, which are used in the New Testament to express this truth, includes the idea of an objective forensic acquittal.\* Ex. 24 : 7, "I will not justify the wicked," refers to no inner change, but to a relation to the law. In Prov. 17 : 15, "He that justifieth the wicked and he that condemneth the innocent are both an abomination in the sight of the Lord," the antithesis is between justification and condemnation, and both are objective in their character. In Matt. 12 : 37, "By thy words thou shalt be justified and by thy words thou shalt be condemned," there is no idea of an inner change, but a forensic decision. In Rom. 5 : 18, 19, and throughout the chapter, the nature of this doctrine is distinctly unfolded, and it is set forth in the clearest light as judicial and external. It is wrapped up in legal terms and relations. The phraseology implies a judge, guilt before the law, and

---

\* *צדק* in Kal'est justitiam habere, in Piel justitiam alicui tribuere, in Hiphil in judicio aliquem absolvere et justitium pronunciare, in Hithpaël, se ipsum justificare et causæ suæ bonitatem demonstrare. Gerh. Loc. Theol., Locus De Justificatione, Proœ. § III.

an acquittal, by virtue of "the righteousness of One" who has made an "atonement." The judgment is to condemnation, *εις κατάκριμα*. the grace, to justification, *εις δικαίωσιν*. "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth," Rom. 8 : 33, implies a judicial accusation, and a free divine absolution. Most plainly is this aspect of truth included in the representation of justification in 2 Cor. 5 : 19—21: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. \* \* \* For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." A correspondence is thus traced between it and the way in which Christ was made sin for us. We are made "righteousness" in Christ, in the same manner as he was made sin for us. But Christ was not made sin for us by actually becoming a sinner, but by bearing our sins imputatively. So we are justified, not by being made intrinsically righteous, or by an infusion, but only *actu forensi*. \* In short, the word to justify, means, properly and generically, to pronounce any one righteous, either when he truly is so, or is really unrighteous. And it is to be remembered, that in the justification of the believer, the person is in fact a sinner, and the act is not a declaration of real moral character. It is not a divine judgment in reference to the moral condition of its object, but a holding of the truly guilty as acquitted for the sake of the vicarious sacrifice and righteousness of Jesus Christ.

2. It consists, partly, in pardon. "Forgiveness of sins before God,"—"for Christ's sake our sins are remitted to us,"—are the phrases in which our Confession describes it. The frequency with which it sets it forth by these terms, indicates how accurately and fully they were regarded as expressing its nature. Forgiveness of sins, and justification before God, are used as interchangeable terms, though in fact justification was acknowledged as including in its full meaning somewhat more than pardon. The Scriptures themselves use the word justification, as an equivalent to forgiveness. St. Paul, in describing justification, Rom. 4 : 7, 8, quotes as an Old Testament statement of it, the words of David, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the

---

\* See Cotta's Note, Ger. Loci, Locus XVII.

man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." So, too, in Acts 13 : 38, 39 : "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins : and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." On the Divine basis of Christ's atonement, in which the penalty of sin has been suffered and the law satisfied, God freely forgives the penitent and believing sinner all his transgressions. On the ground of that death of the Just for the unjust, our offences are wholly blotted out. The sinner is pardoned, and looked upon, in Christ, as though he had never sinned. It is a full absolution. He is acquitted of all charges and released from all penalties. God no longer imputes, or charges, to the sinner the offences of which he had been guilty. There is now no *condemnation*, to them who are in Christ Jesus.

3. It is completed in the *imputation of Christ's righteousness*. This meets the necessities of the sinner's case, in a relation which reaches beyond the simple matter of pardon. Being forgiven, he is not left in the condition of a criminal merely released from punishment. He needs be held not only as absolved from wrath, but as having an acceptable righteousness. His condition must not be a mere negation, but one of positive fulness. Divested alike of his own sins and righteousness, he is not to be held henceforth as miserable and poor and naked, but as clothed in spotless garments and made rich indeed. Hence, in the very act of justification, along with the non-imputation of his sins, God imputes Christ's perfect righteousness to him. Thus, while pardon takes away from the sinner what he has, this imputation gives him what he has not. On one side the penalty of his transgressions is removed, and on the other, the complete righteousness of the Redeemer is placed to his account. The two sides of his need are thus fully met, in the substitutionary provision of saving grace. The accuracy and beauty of the language of the Confession is, therefore, plainly seen, when, in addition to pardon, it declares "righteousness and eternal life are bestowed upon us." "For God regards this faith, and imputes it as righteousness in his sight, Rom. III and IV."

This is the great doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, which stands so centrally in the faith of orthodox Protestantism. It presents with vigor, that

grand and comforting truth of the Gospel, that the believer is "*complete* in Christ who is the Head of all principality and power." Able to work out for himself neither pardon nor righteousness, both are provided in the Saviour's work, and freely and fully bestowed upon him in justification. Merely to forgive the sinner, and let him go, would not be a restoration to the blessedness of the Divine favor from which he is fallen. He needs to be taken back, and treated as righteous, in the fulness of fellowship and love. He is not left poor, but made rich. "For your sakes He became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich," 2 Cor. 8 : 9. He is clothed in the wedding garment, Matt. 22 : 2—13. "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth," Rom. 10 : 4. Instead of his own sin, the obedience of him who is "the Lord, our righteousness" is imputed to him. "For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works," Rom. 4 : 3—6. The fact, that sometimes the "righteousness of Christ," and at other times, our "faith," is said to be imputed to us, involves no contradiction. For faith is introduced merely as apprehending and appropriating the righteousness which is then set down to our account. Moreover, in the distinction made, between pardon, and this imputation, we are not to suppose any real division of the act of justification. Though forgiveness of sins is based entirely on Christ's atoning work, and the imputation of his righteousness implies a reference to his whole obedience for us, our acceptance of Christ secures the benefit of both, which are thus united in the same act of justification. The one divine act of justification brings us both pardon of our past sins and the imputation of Christ's perfect righteousness. It is, also, in this way clearly distinguished from a divine judgment upon the intrinsic character of the sinner, and becomes a free declaration of a gracious absolution and acceptance of the really guilty. And the whole nature of the act is summed up vigorously in the Form of Concord, "We believe, teach, and confess \* \* \* that poor sinful man is justified before God, that is, absolved

and declared free from his sins, and from the sentence of his well-deserved condemnation, and is adopted as a child and heir of eternal life, without any merit or worthiness, and without any antecedent, present, or subsequent works, out of pure grace, for the sake of the merit, the perfect obedience, the bitter sufferings and death, and resurrection of Christ our Lord alone, whose obedience is imputed unto us for righteousness."

#### 4. *The Relation of Faith to Justification.*

The Confession declares we are justified "through faith, —*per fidem, durch den glauben*. These terms express the *instrumental cause* of justification. This point is of such vital importance, and lies so truly in the very heart of this great doctrine of our Church, that its meaning and relations cannot be too accurately and fully grasped. The very characterizing feature of the Gospel is, that it presents salvation as attained through faith. It so fully expresses the essence of the system, that "the faith," is made a synonym of Christianity. And both the object and the power of the Reformation, consisted in the disclosure of the full and indubitable relation of faith to the sinner's justification and salvation. There are three elements in which its nature and office are seen.

1. *Knowledge is implied.* This is the first element of the definition of the older theologians, in which faith is made to consist in knowledge, *notitia*, assent of the mind, *assensus*, and confidence or trust, *fiducia*. The definition is to be accepted as, in substance, correct, but it needs some guarding statements. Undoubtedly, the historical facts, and doctrinal verities of the Gospel, must be known before the sinner can accept the hope and blessings they offer. Men must know the truth, before it can make them free. "And this is eternal life, to know: Thee the true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent," John 17 : 3. Conviction of sin and sense of spiritual need are divinely wrought through the truth in the hands of the Holy Spirit. Yet, however essential a knowledge of the objects of faith may be to its exercise, it is generically different from faith itself. It is rather a pre-requisite to faith. "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" Rom. 10 : 14. The contents of the logical understanding are not the same as an act of faith. And though our Saviour does speak of knowing, *γινωσκειν*, the true God and Jesus

Christ, as eternal life, the eternal life is not the *immediate* result of the knowledge, but the knowledge leads to faith, according to St. Paul's words to Timothy, "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, *through faith in Jesus Christ*," 2 Tim. 3 : 15. Men may have knowledge, even in richest stores, without a particle of real, saving faith. A mere acquaintance with the historical truths and wonderful doctrines of the Gospel, as treasures of the understanding, cannot, in itself, unite the human life to the life of Christ. On this point our Confessors fully rejected the Romish doctrine of the nature of faith. There had been no sharp or true distinction of essential faith from mere historical or doctrinal knowledge. "Our adversaries think that faith consists in knowledge of, or an acquaintance with, the history of Christ."\* Art. XX, defining faith, declares, "The Scriptures, speaking of faith, do not style faith such a knowledge as devils and wicked men have; for it is taught concerning faith in Heb. 11 : 1, that a mere knowledge of the facts of history is not faith." The deep intensity of Luther's experience, in which he came into a true apprehension of the Gospel plan, and repose in Christ as his Saviour, necessarily led to a clear distinction of faith from this merely intellectual knowledge. It was impossible that he should teach a system in which these two things should be confounded. Melancthon's experience concurred with Luther's; and the frequency with which he repeats, in the Apology, the caution against mistaking knowledge for faith, discloses how strongly he wished to place the doctrine of the Gospel on this point over against the error of Rome.

2. It implies the assent of the understanding. These truths and doctrines of Christ must not only be known, but approved. Their excellence and adaptedness must be recognized, in an assenting judgment of the intellect. But here, as in knowledge, this assent is rather a condition precedent to saving faith than faith itself. It is what may be accurately designated as *historical faith*. It is a yielding of the judgment to the contents of the knowledge. "It is not enough for us to know and believe that Christ was born, that he suffered and rose from the dead."† This is

---

\* Apol. Art. IV. (II).

† Apol. Art. IV.

a belief which the devils may have, without any submission of will or affections, to the terms of pardon and salvation. The assent of Reason to the truth, divinity and reliability of the remedial scheme of grace, though essential as a preliminary basis for the act of appropriating the offers of salvation, in which the essence of faith consists, must yet be regarded as but partial and inadequate. This represents the condition of the masses in Christian lands, who, intellectually admit and consent to the truth and excellence of Christianity, but who live in utter indifference and neglect of Christ and salvation. The reason of the inadequacy of this merely assenting judgment of the mind is plain. It lies altogether in the sphere of the natural. It is only the same kind of mental assent as is given to any other historical or scientific truths. It implies no supernatural operation, as a work of grace in the heart, and fails to surrender the affections and life to the power and control of Christ.

3. The essential thing, which itself constitutes the reality and fulness of faith is *Trust*, or *Confidence*. It is the *fidelucia* of the old theologians, and expresses the act in which the penitent reposes on the merit and grace of the Redeemer. In it he accepts Christ who is a perfect Saviour, and lays an appropriating hold of him, as He has been made unto him wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. It brings the believing soul and Christ together. Faith takes Christ, just as he is offered, in all the fulness of his redemption and offices of salvation, and reposes in the infallible promises of his love. It is essentially appropriating act, and one of self-surrender; and whilst knowledge and assent belong wholly to the logical understanding, this surrender to Christ in confidence and reliance embraces the action of the will and the sensibilities. Hence St. Paul declares, with striking definiteness and force, "*With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.*"\*

We must not fail to understand that this faith makes a real appropriation of the merit of Christ. It truly "puts on Christ." The imputation of his righteousness is not to be supposed to be based upon anything short of such a

---

\* The error of Rome on this point is seen in the words of Bellarmin, Justif. l. 4, *Catholici fidem in intellectu sedem habere docent. Denique in ipso actu intellectus.*



vital union as is expressed by the apostle, "I live, yet not I but Christ liveth in me, and the life I now live, I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me." It is not by what faith is, that it justifies, but by what it embraces. It justifies not as a virtue, or intrinsic state of the soul, but as holding within its embrace Christ himself, in all his work and fulness. The Divine Judge does not set over to the believer's account, as a liquidation of his debt, and as accepted righteousness, what his faith has not really grasped. Faith must, therefore, be regarded as apprehending the gracious work and righteousness of Jesus Christ. Hence, Luther's expression, "Faith taketh hold of Christ, and hath him present, and holdeth him enclosed, as the ring doth the precious stone. And whosoever shall be found having this confidence in Christ apprehended in the heart, him will God account for righteous." On Gal. 2 : 16. "This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son," 1 John 5 : 11. Hence it is, that "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life," 1 John 5 : 12. Yet it is not to be understood that it is *Christ's indwelling* that becomes the *ground* of justification, but thus we are put by faith, in such relation to him, that *His whole obedience, even unto death*, is imputed to us. It is through such a reception of him, in the act of faith, that we appropriate the benefits of his vicarious work.

The *particula exclusiva*, the expression *alone*, by which the Reformers guarded so jealously the purity of the relation of faith to justification, was not only demanded by the antagonism of Rome to it, but by the interests of the truth and the Church for all ages. Against all schemes that admitted anything before, after, or along side of Christ apprehended by a divinely wrought faith, it re-asserted the truth into which the Holy Ghost had guided the apostle Paul, Rom. 3 : 28, "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law."

4. This faith is contemplated not as a product of nature, but as a gift of God. In Art. II, it is, in accordance with Scripture, declared that human nature, since the fall, is so under the power of original sin that it can, of its own accord, exercise no true faith in God. Consistently with this, the Apology, Art. IV, sets forth, "Faith is the accep-

tance of this treasure [Christ's merit] with our whole heart, and this is not our own act, present, or gift, our own work or preparation." "This faith is a gift of God, through which we rightly acknowledge Christ our Redeemer in the word of the Gospel, and confide in him."\* It is our confessional response to the divine word, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God," Eph. 2 : 8.

5. This act, as well as the subsequent life of faith, is to be rigorously separated from the idea of merit. Because of its instrumental relation, as conditioning our acceptance before God, there has been a disposition to look upon it as itself a good and meritorious work. There is no deserving worthiness in it. The only worthiness is in Christ, and faith, being itself God's gift, is only the hand that receives the blessings of redemption. Its only activity is that of accepting God's free salvation, and this activity itself is through the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit. The author of the Confession, therefore, defines: "Faith does not justify us before God, as though it were itself our work, but solely because it receives the grace promised and offered without merit, and presented out of the rich treasures of mercy."† This is fully accordant with the statements of Scripture and the conclusions of reason. Though faith be accepted and imputed for righteousness, it is still like every other grace in man, defective and incomplete, and, therefore, cannot become a foundation of confidence. So soon as the believer would trust to the worthiness of his faith, he would turn to something wrought within him and deny Christ as the only foundation. Melancthon, to J. Brentz, 1531, writes, "Faith alone justifies, not because it is the root, or is meritorious, but because it lays hold of Christ, for whose sake we are accepted."‡ The words of Luther to Brentz concur in satisfying us that this is the doctrine meant to be set forth by the Reformers:—"In order that I may have a better view of this thing, I am wont to think of myself as having in my heart no such quality as faith or love: but in place

---

\* Form. Con.

† Apol. Art. IV.

‡ Ideo sola fide sumus justi, non quia radix, ut tu scribis, sed quia apprehendit Christum, propter quem sumus accepti. Corp. Ref. II, 501,

of these, I put Christ himself, and say, 'This is my righteousness.' \*\*

6. In the nature of saving faith, is included, finally, an energy of spiritual transformation and fruitfulness. Though carefully distinguishing between justification, and the spiritual change with which it is connected, our doctrine unequivocally asserts, that no other faith becomes the instrument of justification than a living and transforming one. It fully includes the truth of St. James, "Faith without works is dead." It is no real and living recipient. Though the holiness and works wrought by faith have no merit, and are not to be mistaken as forming any part of the ground of justification, yet the faith that does really embrace Christ, does, and must work by love and purify the heart. "We speak of faith," says the Apology, "as being not an idle fancy, but a new light, life, and power in the heart, that renews the heart and disposition, transforms man into a new creature." "Faith wherever, and while it exists, bears good fruit." "Love and works must follow faith." These are its evidences and seals. They prove its presence, reality and power, as springing grain and blooming flowers prove the presence and power of spring.

But as the connection of faith with good works, forms the special subject of Art. XX, no further disussion of it is here needed, than this simple statement of the kind of faith referred to by our Confession in the doctrine of this Article

We have thus recalled the teaching of this Article on the great subject which it sets forth. Together with an utter repudiation of the destructive error of Rome, it declares, in brief, but bold outline, the true doctrine of the Gospel and of our Church. It presents the *Source* of Justification wholly in the free grace of God. It asserts the only *Ground* of it to be found in the work of Jesus Christ, who, as the Godman, taking the sinner's place, by his vicarious obedience and suffering, made satisfaction to justice and violated law and brought in, for the guilty, a perfect and everlasting righteousness. The *Nature* of it is not that of an internal change, but a forensic, or governmental absolution of the punishment due to sin, together with an imputation of Christ's finished righteousness. This pardon and imputation are conditioned solely in a hearty re-

---

\* Neander Hist. Dog. p. 663.

ception of Christ, in a faith which is itself the gift of God, not meritorious, but living and transforming. And thus pardoned and accepted for Christ's sake in *justification*, the same faith to which all this is graciously given, takes Christ also for *sanctification*, in which, as a divine internal operation, generically distinct from the forensic act of justification, the forgiven sinner becomes a new creature in Christ, and is made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.

It only remains now, in conclusion, to note, briefly, the harmony of other Confessions and orthodox Churches in the essential features of this doctrine, with their variations and differences from it in some of its aspects; and especially, to trace how absolutely and sharply it cuts off from itself and rejects the various errors of heterodox sects.

This is one of the great doctrines in which the Protestant Churches are essentially agreed. The Augsburg Confession, in accordance with the grand design of Luther, Melancthon, and their co-laborers, was meant to set forth the broad, clear, and full doctrines of the Gospel in their true catholicity. The Augsburg Confession concludes with this assurance of its own design, "That it might be clearly perceived, that by us nothing is received either in doctrine or ceremonies, which might be contrary to the Holy Scriptures, or opposed to the universal Church." The denominational idea was unknown to them; and in declaring the truth of the Gospel, they designed the reformation of the aggregate church, and its restoration, in its universality, to its old foundations. Whilst, therefore, from its honorable priority, our Church, in its great Confession, took no denominational position, and gave itself no denominational marks and peculiarities, others co-laboring in the general reformatory aim, but, as we conceive, on narrower ground, framed for themselves more exclusive creeds and defined their position in denominational separation from the Augustana. It is to be regretted, that subsequently, a part of our Church, forsaking its original conception of embodying only the fundamental truths of revived universal Christianity, and accepting the partizan, or denominational idea, sought in the Form of Concord to narrow our confessional basis, and define and restrict it in partizan and non-fundamental limitations. Yet the different denominations that separated by distinctive confessional tenets from the general Confession

at Augsburg, have accepted, with hardly a variation, the great and central doctrine of this Article.

This happy agreement is made manifest by an examination of some of the principal Confessions of the different Reformed and Calvinistic Churches, which took a doctrinal position denominationally distinct from the Church of the Augsburg Confession.

The *Confession of Basle*, 1547, Art. IX, declares, "We acknowledge the forgiveness of sins through faith in Jesus Christ, the crucified One. Though this faith continually exercises, and manifests itself, by works of love, we do not ascribe righteousness and satisfaction for our sins to these works which are fruits of faith; but solely to true confidence and faith in the shed blood of the Lamb of God."\*

The *Gallican Confession*, adopted by the Reformed Church in France, 1559, Art. XVIII, says, "We rely upon the obedience of Christ alone, which is imputed to us, so that all our sins are covered, and we attain favor before God. Art. XX, "We believe that we become partakers of Christ's righteousness by faith alone \* \* \* and this occurs in such a way that the promises of life offered to us in him (Christ) are then applied to our use and rendered efficacious to us, when we embrace them, not doubting that those things will be fulfilled to us, of which we have been assured by the mouth of God."†

---

\* *Confitemur remissionem peccatorum per fidem in Jesum Christum crucifixum. Et quamvis haec Fides per opera charitatis, se sine intermissione exercet, exerit, atque ita probatur: attamen justitiam et satisfactionem pro peccatis nostris, non tribuimus operibus, quae Fidei fructus sunt; sed tantum verae fiduciae et fidei, in effusum sanguinem Agni Dei. Quoted from Niemeyer, Coll. Confess. Ref. p. 98.*

† Art. XVIII, *In sola Christi obedientia prorsus acquiescimus, quae quidem nobis imputantur, tum et tegantur omnia nostra peccato, tum etiam ut gratiam coram Deo nanciscamur. Art. XX, Credimus, nos sola fide fieri justitiae participes: \* \* \* hoc autem ideo fit, quod promissiones vitae nobis in ipso (Christo) oblatæ tunc usui nostro applicantur et nobis redduntur efficaces, cum eas amplectimur, nihil ambigentes nobis obventura, de quibus ore Dei certiores sumus. Quoted from Winer, Dartstel. Des Lehrbegriffs, pp. 96, 99.*

In the *Palatine, or Heidelberg Catechism*, 1563, probably the most important of all the Reformed Confessions, Question 60, "How art thou justified before God? is answered: "Only by a true faith in Jesus Christ; so that though my conscience accuse me that I have grossly transgressed all the commands of God, and kept none of them, and am still inclined to all evil; notwithstanding God, without any merit of mine, but only of mere grace, grants and imputes to me the perfect satisfaction, righteousness and holiness of Christ; even so, as if I never had had, nor committed any sin; yea, as if I had fully accomplished all that obedience which Christ hath accomplished for me; inasmuch as I embrace such benefit with a believing heart."\*

In its definition of Faith, it declares, "It is not only a certain knowledge, whereby I hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in His word, but also an assured confidence, which the Holy Ghost works by the Gospel in my heart; that not only to others but to me also, remission of sin, everlasting righteousness, and salvation, are freely given by God, merely of grace, only for the sake of Christ's merits."

*The Second Helvetic Confession*, 1566, declares: "To justify is to remit sins, absolve from guilt and punishment, to receive into favor and declare righteous. \* \* \* For Christ, having taken the sins of the world upon himself, made satisfaction for them to divine justice. Therefore, on account of Christ alone, who suffered and rose, God is merciful to our unrighteousness, and does not impute our sins unto us, but imputes to us the righteousness of Christ. \* \* \* But since we receive this justification, not through any works, but through faith in Christ and the mercy of God, so we teach and believe with the Apostle, that the sinner is justified by faith alone in

---

\* Sola fide Iesum Christum, adeo ut licet mea me conscientia accuset, quod adversus omnia mandata Dei graviter peccaverim, nec ullum eorum servaverim, adhaec etiamnum ad omne malum propensus sim, nihilominus tamen, (modo haec beneficia vera animi fiducia amplectar,) sine ullo meo merito, ex mera Dei misericordia, mihi perfecta satisfactio, justitia et sanctitas Christi, imputetur ac donetur; perinde ac si nec ullum ipse peccatum admissem, nec ulla mihi labe inhaereret; imo vero quasi eam obedientiam, quam pro me Christus praestitit, ipse perfecte praestitissem. From Niemyer, Coll. Conf. Ref.

Christ, not by the law or by any works, \* \* because faith receives Christ as our righteousness, and attributes all things to the grace of God in Christ; so that justification is attributed to faith, altogether on account of Christ, and not as our own work. For it is the gift of God."\*

In the *Thirty-Nine Articles* of the Church of England, 1562, the definition of Justification, according to Dr. Short,† was probably derived from Melancthon's *Loci Communes*, and thus closely harmonizes with the Augustana, in the declaration: "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith and not for our own works and deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort."

The *Westminster Confession*, 1647, Chap. XI, puts the doctrine into minute specifications: "Those whom God effectually calls, He also freely justifies; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous: not for any work wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone: not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God. Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is alone the instrument of justification; yet it is

---

\* Justificare significat Apostolo in disputatione de justificatione, peccata remittere, a culpa et poena absolvere, in gratiam recipere, et justum pronunciare. \* \* \* Etenim Christus peccata mundi in se recepit et sustulit, divinaeque justitiae satisfecit. Deus ergo propter solum Christum passum et resuscitatum, propitius est peccatis nostris nec illa nobis imputat, imputat autem justitiam Christo pro nostra. \* \* Quoniam vero nos justificationem hanc recipimus, non per ulla opera, sed per fidem in Dei misericordiam et Christum, ideo docemus et credimus cum Apostolo, hominem peccatorem justificare solo fide in Christum, non lege, aut ullis operibus: quia fides Christum justitiam nostram recepit et gratiae Dei in Christo omnia tribuit, ideo fidei tribuitur justificatio, maxime propter Christum, et non ideo, quia nostrum opus est. Donum enim Dei est. Niemyer, Coll. Conf. p. 494.

† Hist. Ch. of Eng. Chap. VI.



not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but worketh by love."

This doctrine is expressed in similar terms in the *First Helvetic Confession*, 1538, the *Consensus Tigurinus*, 1549, the *Genevan Catechism*, 1545, the *Belgic Confession*, 1562, the *Bohemian*, 1535, the *Remonstrant*, and other Confessions. They all agree in representing justification, over against the teaching of Rome, as a Divine act, forensic in its character, based alone on the work and merit of Christ, through a true faith that apprehends and appropriates his vicarious obedience unto death, attended with renewal and good works, which, without forming in us the least merit, yet become the needed witness of the reality and power of the saving faith. This great heart-doctrine of the Reformation, in which revived Christianity re-asserted itself, has, therefore, flowed out, in its essential forms, from the great Confession at Augsburg, and become the inheritance of all orthodox Protestantism.

It must be noted, however, as necessary to a true and full view of this point, that though the article of justification, in its separate form is thus found to agree in these various creeds, yet placed in the midst of a low Arminian theory, on the one hand, or of the rigid Calvinistic system, on the other, the doctrine has a somewhat different significance and import. It stands in the midst of different relations, and becomes theologically modified by its bearings as viewed from a new stand-point. Thus, Arminianism, with its semi-naturalism and undue exaltation of human ability, diminishes the divine grace of the act of justification, under self-complacent and unscriptural notions of working out our own salvation. And in the scheme of an absolute Predestination, justification by faith, instead of being central in the economy of salvation, is forced into a merely subordinate place. It does not present the pivoting point on which a sinner's free and gracious salvation really turns, or where God's grace meeting human freedom, personal salvation is determined in the issue. It is not, as it is in the Lutheran theology, the presentation of an open door, where there is entrance provided and offered to a world of perishing men, redeemed by Jesus' blood. But it is simply a fixed and subordinate divine act, carrying out a particular divine decree of grace to the individual. The decree of predestination meets us at the outset,

settling, at the very beginning, the final destiny of the elect person. From this decree everything takes start, by it everything is shaped, and has its significance. Personal salvation stands, from the first, in the pronounced fiat of a Sovereign Will. The hidden decree has fixed everything; and the incarnation and death of Christ for the elect alone, the Gospel call, irresistible grace, justification and sanctification, come in simply as carrying out the decisive decree.\* Hence, the Westminster Confession, with the rigorous logic that bends all parts into the harmony of the system, adds to the part already quoted on this subject, "God did, from all eternity, decree to justify all the elect; and Christ did, in the fulness of time, die for their sins, and rise again for their justification: nevertheless they are not justified, until the Holy Spirit doth, in due time, actually apply Christ unto them." The offer of the Gospel, therefore, is not thus a presentation of an open privilege through justification, in which their salvation may be decided, as the point where Divine grace comes to human freedom, in a mysterious but real opportunity whose issue determines the question of personal salvation or ruin. It is simply an included step in the sinner's already settled way to heaven. For it is to be remembered that the Divine decrees, in this system, refer primarily not to any gift of grace to be offered to the sinner's acceptance in Christ, but to the final destiny itself. Leaping over all the intermediate space, they decide the end itself. In this, we conceive, the Gospel offer of free justification loses its significance as

---

\* In confirmation of this statement, see Dr. A. A. Hodge, on The Atonement, p. 389. "The entire analogy and spirit of Calvin's system was, as a whole, broadly characterized by the subjection of Redemption to Election as a means to an end. The able, learned and impartial F. Christian Baur, in his History of the Atonement, (A. D., 1838,) says: 'Zwingle and Calvin did indeed adhere to the dogma of Satisfaction in its traditional form; but from their point of view, the Satisfaction itself was subsumed under the idea of the absolute decree, in relation to which the satisfaction of Christ was not the *causa meritoria* of salvation, but only the *causa instrumentalis* carrying out the purpose of redemption.' That this is true, so far as it represents Calvin subordinating the purpose of redemption to the purpose of election, every student of his *Institutes* and of his *Consensus Genevensis*, knows."

presenting the deciding point in the matter of salvation. In the Scriptural predestination, as it appears to us to be correctly taught by our Church,—“elect according to foreknowledge,”—“Whom He did foreknow, he did also predestinate,” in which the Divine decree is conditioned in foreknowledge, and not foreknowledge on the decree,—justification by faith is the point where a redeemed race may come and realize forgiveness and salvation. But in the Calvinistic system, it presents no such free privilege, save to the elect, and even in their case it is a point that decides nothing. The decision was fixed before, and this is only a stadium on the way. The Article of justification is shorn of its grand importance and its decisive relation. It is no longer the characterizing doctrine of the scheme of grace.

But in the doctrine of this Article, it is seen how rigorously and fully our Church bears testimony against all the *heresies* that have appeared on this subject in the history of Christianity. Its clear and decisive teaching cuts them all off in the sharpest rejection. It has already appeared how the deadly errors of Rome have been excluded. The *Symbol of the Greek Church* gives no definition of the doctrine.\* According to *Kirspinski*, however, the form of Justification is made to consist in the forgiveness of sins, and a *change of the heart to holiness*. This constitutes it, in part, internal and transitive, and involves the very root of all the rejected Romish errors.

The error of the *Anabaptists*, who, in accordance with their fanatical subjective system, made justification an inward change to purity, is witnessed against in this Article.

The same is true of the *Schwenkfeldian* view, which taught that the righteousness of faith is not to be thought of as something existing without us in Christ, but as really implanted with Christ in our hearts and souls, through faith, so that it dwells in us, and we are thereby inwardly renewed.

The teaching of *Osiander*, who, starting with Luther's frequent statement, that faith becomes the medium of the real indwelling of Christ, maintained that the righteousness of Christ thus passes into the inner life of the believer, who is thus justified, not by the *imputation* of Christ's righte-

---

\* See Winer, *Darstellung des Lehrbegriffs*, p. 95.

ousness, but by a real *communication* of it, is excluded by the doctrine of our Church.

The *Socinians* rightly regarded justification as a legal transaction, and, as to its objective character, maintained the Evangelical view, but by their rejection of the doctrine of a vicarious sacrifice, they have left no ground for any pardon and justification, and this truth becomes untruth in their system.

The *Mennonites*,\* and the *Quakers*,† both have fallen into the common error of heresy, placing justification in the work wrought within the believer, and confounding it with renewal and sanctification. As is well illustrated in the history of these sects, nothing can save any system embodying such an error at its very heart, from degenerating into multiform incongruities and distortions.

It is thus apparent that every form of false and destructive teaching on this subject includes one or more of the following errors: 1. Rejection of the vicarious atonement and obedience of Christ, as in Arian or Unitarian theologies, leaving no divine or possible ground of justification; 2. Pelagian exaltation of human ability, and reliance on human strength and works; 3. Denial of the purely forensic character of justification; 4. Making its nature consist in an internal change, according to some modification of the idea of an indwelling righteousness, thus confounding it with sanctification, and shutting out the penitent sinner from any hope of acceptance, save on the ground, or in view of, the holy life wrought within him.

Our Confession, however, maintains the positive truths that stand opposed to each and all of these errors, and insists on the central position and characterizing nature of justification by faith, in the Gospel of salvation. We rejoice in the historical priority and pre-eminence which Providence has given our Church in recovering this doctrine, in its purity and power, to Christendom, from under the perversions of the Romish apostacy, and setting it forth again, as showing the open way of salvation, to a perishing world. We are glad of this great heritage. And we know of no more fitting language with which to conclude this discussion, than the ringing words of Luther in the Smalcald Articles: "Upon this Article depends all

---

\* Reis, Conf. Art. XXI, (Winer, p. 96.)

† Barclarii, Apol. 7 : 3, p. 128.

that we teach and do against the Pope, the devil, and the world." "Whatever may happen, though heaven and earth should fall, nothing in this article can be rescinded or repealed." Part II. Art. I.

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE SABBATH QUESTION, IN ITS HISTORICAL RELATIONS, AND BEARINGS UPON THE FAITH AND LIFE OF THE CHURCH,

By Rev. H. E. JACOB, A. M., Phillipsburg, Pa.

The views which have been entertained, concerning the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, may be arranged under three classes: 1. The Antinomian; 2. The Sabbatarian; 3. The Dominical. In the present Article, we propose, first, to ascertain the position held by these several forms of doctrine, and then, to examine them, with special reference to some of their historical relations, and practical bearings upon the life and the faith of the Church.

#### I. THE ANTINOMIAN VIEW.

This view ignores all distinctions of times. It declares that, inasmuch as all days are alike, we need no fixed day for religious worship. Sunday requires no observance different from other days. There can be nothing sinful in devoting it to the pursuit of ordinary business. The Lord's Day, as a special season for the contemplation of Divine truth, is a remnant of Judaism, which we should reject and despise. It may be kept as a holiday for recreation and relaxation; but, to give more attention to the truth on this day than on others, is not only unnecessary, but even preposterous.

This doctrine was first taught by Anabaptists and Antinomians, about the time of the Reformation, and has more recently found advocates in some who talk about a religious non-observance of the Lord's Day. It is supported by the arguments ordinarily employed, on this subject, by German Rationalists, and those in our own country, who would strike all Sunday laws from our statute-books, and make the day one of feasting and frolic, or business.

## II. THE SABBATARIAN VIEW.

This phase of doctrine exists in three different forms:

1. *Strict Sabbatarianism* makes no distinction between the Lord's Day and the Jewish Sabbath. Not only does it insist upon a divine obligation to devote one day in seven to worship, but regarding the Third Commandment as throughout moral, contends that the seventh day must be sanctified, with all the circumstances of time, and mode of observance, which were binding under the Old Dispensation.

2. *Puritanic Sabbatarianism* recognizes a ceremonial element in the Third Commandment, but maintains, that this has reference only to the particular day of the week, which is to be observed. The Sabbath has not been abrogated; but has been transferred from Saturday to Sunday, and, therefore, the Lord's Day and the Sabbath are identical institutions. The Westminster Larger Catechism thus expresses it: "The Fourth Commandment requireth of all men the sanctifying or keeping holy to God, such set times as He hath appointed in his Word, expressly one whole day in seven; which was the seventh, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, and the first day of the week ever since, and so to continue to the end of the world; which is the Christian Sabbath, and in the New Testament called *the Lord's Day*." Regarding the Lord's Day in this light, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that all the regulations, in reference to the observance of the Sabbath, contained in the Old Testament, must still remain in force. "The Sabbath or Lord's Day, is to be sanctified by an holy resting all that day, not only from such works as are at all times sinful, but even from such worldly employments and recreations, as are on other days lawful; and making it our delight to spend the *whole* time (except so much of it, as is to be taken up in works of necessity and mercy), in the public and private exercises of God's house." This form of Sabbatarianism is frequently carried very far, and becomes very exacting, as may be seen by a reference to the history of the New England colonies, where Puritanism flourished in its normal form. For the sake of illustration, we need only cite several sections from the code of laws, prepared for the government of the colonies of Massachusetts and New Haven. Among articles drawn up for the former colony by John

Cotton, is the following, which is quoted in Barber's History of Connecticut, as in force also in the latter colony: "No one shall run on the Sabbath day, or walk in his garden, or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting." In Hinman's Blue Laws of Connecticut, are, also, found the following sections, from Governor Eaton's Code for New Haven, (1656,) "38. If any man shall kiss his wife, or wife her husband on the Lord's Day, the party in fault, shall be punished at the discretion of the magistrate." "28. Whosoever shall profane the Lord's Day or any part of it, by work or sport, shall be punished by fine or corporally. But if the Court, by clear evidence find that the sin was *proudly, presumptuously*, and with a *high hand* committed against the command and authority of the Blessed God, such person therein reproaching the Lord shall be put to death."\* It would not be difficult to multiply evidences of similar extravagancies.

Many of those adhering to this doctrine concerning the Sabbath, consider the ringing of a bell for assembling congregations on the Lord's Day, as a grievous sin; and in the same manner regard the use of a musical instrument, even though it be for the purpose of assisting worshippers in their devotions. It is mentioned by the biographer of an eminent English authoress, as one of her excellences, that she was never seen to smile on the "Sabbath." In our own experience, we have known those who, adopting this Puritanic view, have actually suffered from cold on the Lord's Day, fearing that by kindling a fire, they would transgress the Third Commandment. One who may read these lines, will perhaps remember a string which, on a Lord's Day, he determined to take from the floor, but which a conscience perverted by this form of Sabbatarianism compelled him to leave until the morrow; checking him in the very attempt, with the admonition that he was about performing what was neither a work of necessity, nor mercy, nor worship. At one of the leading institu-

---

\* For a thorough examination of the genuineness of these articles, see "The Bampton Lectures for 1860", by Dr. Hessey, a store-house of facts, which is invaluable to all who desire to investigate this question with any thoroughness. Hinman's collection of "Blue Laws," is to be carefully distinguished from the fabrications of Peters. See article on the Blue Laws of Connecticut, by Rev. E. H. Gillett, D. D., in N. Y. Observer, for July 15th, 1869.



tions of learning in this country, it was formerly maintained, that the reading of the historical books of the Bible, on the Lord's Day, was a violation of the Third Commandment.

3. *Mild Sabbatarianism.* The legal strictness of Puritanic Sabbatarianism is rejected by a great many who still persist in identifying the Lord's Day with the Sabbath. They maintain that the Sabbath is an institution of universal moral obligation; but at the same time, that it is to be celebrated in the spirit of Gospel liberty. They reject the doctrine which teaches the abrogation of the Sabbath, because they fear that the belief of such a doctrine, will weaken the regard, with which we should consider the the Lord's Day; but at the same time, in order to justify them in their necessary departure from the strictness of the letter of the Jewish Sabbath laws, they appeal to the example of Christ, who taught that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. The scrupulousness of Puritanism, they condemn as a splitting of hairs, a straining at gnats, "Pharisaic nicety about the letter," but they have no less abhorrence to Dominicalism, which they regard as the source of the grossest Antinomian license. They are rigid in insisting upon the necessity of a Sabbath under the Christian dispensation; but believe that Gospel liberty has removed the yoke of much that was annoying and inconvenient, in the Sabbath of the Old Dispensation.

### III. THE DOMINICAL VIEW.

Those who may be comprehended under the name of Dominicals, believe that the Sabbath was an ordinance of the Ceremonial Law. The Word of God, they maintain, both in the Old and the New Testament, declares it to be such; and the texts, by which ordinances of the Moral Law are to be determined, utterly fail when applied here. There is no argument, they declare, adduced to prove the perpetuity of this day, which remains after careful, thorough, impartial scrutiny.

But Dominicalism is not Antinomianism. It does not seek to undermine the authority of the Lord's Day, but simply to put it upon its true basis, so that its claims may be more universally acknowledged, and the true sanctification of the day more fully promoted. It regards the proper observance of the Lord's Day, as a "*signum aut*

*stantis aut cadentis Christiani.*" All who may be classed as Dominicals, although differing on minor points, agreed in this, viz.: that a stated day for rest and worship is needed. Some ground the necessity for the observance of the Lord's Day, upon the practice of Christ and the Apostles, which they regard, as in itself involving a command. Others refer it to a positive enactment of the Church, which, say they, being guided by the Holy Ghost, can at any time impose upon its members rules of faith and life of no less binding authority, than those contained in the Word of God.

Still others, regarding the day solely in its relations to the Word, consider their duty to observe the Lord's Day, to be derived from the necessity of setting apart some time for the exercises of devotion; this time must be fixed; and as the Church following the example of the Lord, (which, however, was not intended in the light of a command, but simply in that of a ratification of what the infant Church had already done), has set apart the first day of the week for this purpose, the observance of this appointment is binding upon all, on account of the disorder which a disregard of it would introduce into the Church.

Neither is Dominicalism a unit, as to the manner in which the whole day is to be employed. All its adherents maintain the necessity of entire rest from ordinary employments. All business transactions are contrary to its teachings. But within this limit, there is a variety, in the strictness, with which the day is observed. Some attach all its importance to the public preaching of the Word, and the other exercises of the sanctuary; and, therefore, discourage public transactions, solely on account of the effect which they would have, in preventing those engaged in business, from attending the house of God. Whilst they, therefore, condemn the Antinomian position, they have no hesitancy in making the Lord's Day, a day of relaxation and enjoyment. They attend worship at the stated hours; but do not think it wrong to fill up the interval, with social calls and such amusements, as would be proper on a mere holiday.

Others, believing that the benefit to be derived from the services of the sanctuary, is hindered by such devotion of the hours intervening between worship, to recreation, regard the Lord's Day as a period, in which we are not only to attend the house of God, but also to refrain from every-

thing which would distract the mind, from the consideration of the truth which is there heard. Innocent as certain relaxations may be, the transition between them, and the solemn acts of divine worship, is too great to be allowed in the space of a few hours. A day devoted jointly to divine worship, and the more trifling affairs of life, will so associate the Word, with what is light and trivial, as to deprive it of all its solemnity. Although the true child of God will engage in nothing, upon which he cannot ask his Father's blessing, yet, it is manifest, that certain frames of mind perfectly proper at times, are very unsuitable to those who are about to engage in the special contemplation of Divine truth. He who devotes the portions of Good Friday which intervene between the hours of worship, to social relaxation and enjoyment proper at other times, will loose much of the practical benefit derived from the consideration of the great truth, which that day commemorates. Of little profit, are the services of the sanctuary to those who do not seek them with prepared minds, or, who, instead of hiding the word in their hearts, immediately plunge into such a round of pleasure, as to lead them to forget what they had learned, or if not, to prevent all self-examination according to the truth as heard, or all testing by God's Word, as to whether the words of man actually are, what they claim to be, the words of God.

Many Dominicals likewise maintain, that the Lord's Day should also be devoted to private worship, in which the current of worldiness may be broken, and the mind give that time and attention to the study of the Scriptures, and private meditation and prayer, which the duties of the week prevent. They claim for this observance of the Lord's Day, Apostolic example, Rev. 1 : 10. Exclusive of worldly occupations and enjoyments, as this form of Dominicalism, is, the difference between it, and the stricter forms of Sabbatarianism, is very marked, inasmuch as the one, notwithstanding its protest, still labors under the burden of the Law, whilst the other rejoices in the glorious freedom of the Gospel: the one abstains from worldly pleasures, on account of fear; the other, on account of love: the one is constrained by necessity; the other, by pure delight: the strict Sabbatarian observes the "Sabbath," because he feels that he must: the other, the Lord's Day, because the soul which longs for God, bounds with pleasure

to its Master's worship. The one thinks chiefly of the day; the other, of the Word, with which the day is occupied.

The position of the Lutheran Church, as set forth in the Confessions, so far as the origin of the Lord's Day is concerned, is that of those who keep the day, solely on account of the necessity of a uniform time for Divine worship. A comparison of the explanations of the Third Commandment, found in Luther's Small Catechism, and the Westminster Shorter Catechism, shows the difference between Lutheran Dominicalism and Sabbatarianism:

## LUTHER'S SMALL CATECHISM.

What is meant by this Commandment?

A. We should so fear and love God, as not to despise His word and the preaching of the Gospel, but deem it holy, and willingly learn it.

## WESTMINSTER SHORTER CATECHISM.

What is required in the Fourth Commandment?

A. The Fourth Commandment requireth the keeping holy to God, such set times as He hath appointed in His word; expressly one day in seven to be a holy Sabbath to Himself.

*Luther's Larger Catechism.* We keep the holy days (G. *Feiertage*, L. *Festos Dies*) \* \* \* \* chiefly for this reason, that, on such day of rest (G. *Rugetage*, L. *Sabbati*),\* inasmuch as otherwise there is no room for this, leisure and time may be taken for divine worship, so that we may assemble to hear and consider the word of God, and likewise praise God, in hymns, canticles and prayers. But with us this is not so bound to certain days, as it was with the Jews, so that this or that day must be afforded; for no day is better or more excellent than another. This indeed ought to be done daily, but since the mass of people, occupied with business, cannot afford it, at least one day in the week, should be devoted to this service, and as those who have preceded us, have set apart the Lord's

---

\* It is worthy of remark, that whilst the Latin of the Larger Catechism refers to the Lord's Day as a *Sabbatum*, the original German carefully avoids the term Sabbath. A comparison of the Third Commandment as found in the Catechisms, compared with it, as rendered in Luther's translation of Exodus XX, in the German Bible, shows us what in this Commandment, he regarded as ceremonial and what as moral.

## GERMAN BIBLE.

Ex. XX : 8, *Gedenke des Sabbathtages das du ihn heiligest.*

## CATECHISMS.

*Du sollt den Feiertag heiligen.*

Day, this harmless custom of the ancients, already received, inasmuch as it has been universally adopted should, not be rashly changed, lest some one, by his unnecessary innovation, may disturb all things."

The Larger Catechism condemns the opinion extensively prevalent, that the day was truly sanctified by a hearing of one mass, or the Gospels on Sundays. "Know that it is not sufficient for us to hear only; we should also learn and observe: and think not, that it is left to your discretion, or that little depends on it, but that it is God's commandment, who will require of you, how you have heard, learned and honored His Word." But our Church does not define the extent to which we should refrain on the Lord's Day, from everything which is not directly connected with the contemplation of Divine truth. This she leaves to Christian liberty. She is unwilling to lay down any rule, which, while it might prove of advantage to some, would be an unnecessary burden to others.\* An enlightened Christian conscience delighting in God's service, she esteems in this case, a sufficient guide; and, hence, is unwilling to obscure the Word of God, by adding to it human traditions. All that she asks, is that her children upon the Lord's Day, render the Word of God that honor, which is its due. Her position often so grossly misunderstood and perverted, notwithstanding the clear testimony which she has given, has thus been expressed by one of the authors of the Form of Concord: "It is, therefore, profitable for meditation and edification, that one day in the week be so devoted to worship, that on it no work be performed, or business undertaken, which, as in a sacred assembly, does not belong to the hearing of the Word, the partaking of the Sacraments, public prayers, thanksgiving, bestowal of alms, and other exercises of devotion. We should then, also, abstain from other works and business interfering with the public ministry, lest these exercises should disturb or interrupt us, by some hindrance or distraction."†

*Relation of these Views, to the Systems of Doctrine, which they Represent.*

All truth is a unit. An error in doctrine on the least

---

\* *Vide* Augsburg Confession, XXVIII : § 63, 64.

† Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Tridenti. Chapter, De Diebus Festis.*

point, bears a certain relation to an error, on a point more important. There is no error so small as to be unimportant. Small as it may appear, it is either the outcropping of an extensive latitudinarian tendency, or the germ of fruit, which hereafter may develop itself unto death.

In examining, therefore, a man's views on any point of doctrine, we will find them to depend largely upon his belief on other doctrinal points, unless he have no system, his opinions being a melange, composed of the view of one teacher on one point, and another teacher on another point, without any consideration of the gross inconsistencies which may exist between the two. The creed of every reflecting man, has, however, a certain consistency. This, it is true, is not so perfect in all its parts, that from our knowledge of the form of one member, we can construct the whole body; for just as all truth is a unit, so, also, there is a certain inconsistency in all error, as not all error is pure error, but has certain particles of truth mingled with it. We do not propose, therefore, from his views concerning the Sabbath, to construct the system of doctrine which any one may hold, but simply to deal with facts, in an examination of the relationship which these several views, bear to the creeds of those, by whom they are advocated.

#### *Anabaptism and Antinomianism.*

The view of the Sabbath, professed by many of the Anabaptists, is in perfect harmony with the general character of their expressed belief on other articles. An extreme spiritualizing tendency underlies the whole system. In its professed zeal for the spirit of Christianity, it overlooks the letter, imagining that, as the essence of religion consists entirely in that which lies within, the observance of all external rites and ordinances must be omitted. This system entirely ignores the fact, that there is a sphere, in which the inner and spiritual, is acted upon and developed, only through that which is external and in a certain sense, material. Just as the Anabaptists deny the practical necessity of a day of rest and worship, and despise the Lord's Day, as an outward thing of no importance to Christians, so, also, they maintain, that the outward Word of God, is not necessary, but that the Holy Ghost is imparted, independently of the means of grace, through the inner light of Christ in man. Here we find a violation

of the moral element of the Third Commandment, a despising of God's Word and the preaching of the Gospel. The low place which they give to the external Word, is thus seen to be the true source of their opposition, to the proper observance of the Lord's Day, inasmuch as it leads them to esteem all days, for the study and consideration of this Word, as of no importance.

So, also, their doctrine which teaches that some men may attain to such perfection in this life, that they cannot sin, and their fanatical dreams concerning a reign of the saints upon earth prior to the second coming of Christ, harmonize with their view of the Lord's Day, inasmuch as their position on all these points, implies belief in the attainment of such a state in this life, that the worldly may be entirely absorbed in the spiritual.

In keeping too with their position in regard to the Lord's Day, is that which they have taken, concerning all other appointments, for the preservation of order. They thus have carried the freedom of the Gospel into licentiousness, esteeming the ministry of little importance, exalting a fancied inner above the outward call, despising ordination, and abusing the doctrine concerning the universal priesthood of believers, to the production of the grossest irregularities in the Christian Church. So, also, in their misconception of their spiritual kingship of Christians, they despised the powers that be, teaching that believers dare neither hold civil offices, nor obey rulers. The whole Anabaptist system, of which this error concerning the Lord's Day forms a part, is thus shown to have its origin in a gross misconception of the nature of the Gospel.

The same principle underlies Antinomianism. Both overestimate the ability of the regenerate. Both overlook that imperfection and infirmity which cleave even to those who, in this life, are most fully controlled by the Holy Ghost. Both forget that, "the old Adam, like an unruly and obstinate animal, still constitutes a portion of them, and must be forced into the obedience of Christ, not only by the teaching, admonition, urging and threatening of the law, but frequently by the rod of chastisement and affliction, until this sinful flesh is wholly put off, and man is perfectly renewed in the Resurrection." Both imagine the conditions of Heaven transferred to inhabitants of Earth, and expect Christian life to be developed in man by the Holy Ghost, so as to take possession of his whole nature,



and without any agency or co-operation of the person thus regenerated, to work in and through him the will of God. The Scriptural doctrine of human passivity in regeneration, is thus carried over into the unscriptural doctrine of human passivity in sanctification. This view of the Lord's Day is the Scylla which we must avoid; but the Charybdis is no less dangerous.

*Sabbatarianism in its Scriptural Relations.*

Sabbatarianism embraces many different shades of view, verging from the strictest legalism, to a form so exceedingly mild, that there is often a difficulty, in distinguishing it from Dominicalism. We must, therefore, be very careful not to ascribe to milder Sabbatarians, what can be said only of those who maintain the stricter view. All, however, agree in this, viz.: that the observance of the Lord's Day, is directly enjoined in the Third Commandment, in other words, that the Sabbath and the Lord's Day are identical institutions, or the Lord's Day is a Sabbath. In this connection, it is necessary to refer to the Scriptural claims of this position.\* Our rejection of Sabbatarianism, must depend solely, upon the testimony which the Word of God has given us, concerning the ceremonial character of the Sabbath. If it can be clearly established that Ex. 31 : 17; Ez. 20 : 12, 20; Rom. 14 : 5; Gal. 4 : 5; Col. 2 : 17, refer only to a specific, and not also to a generic Sabbath, Sabbatarianism has established its position. Upon these passages, all discussion for seeking the truth, must concentrate. Other passages are to be considered only in the relation which they sustain to these. Gen. 2 : 3, proves nothing when considered by itself. Clearly as it may seem, at first sight, to refer to an institution of that ordinance, directly after the creation, its testimony is no clearer, than that of the first chapter of Genesis, which, at first sight, seems to be a connected narrative of events directly consecutive; but which the discoveries of Geology show, must have another meaning, than that which the superficial student, ignorant of the testimony of the rocks, would assign to it. God's truth is not to be torn into sentences, which are to be considered apart from each other, but is to be viewed as one connected whole, harmonious throughout. Revelation is to be interpreted by revelation; Scripture by

---

\* See also *Evangelical Review* for January, 1869, Vol. XX. p. 136.

Scripture. The proleptical interpretation of this passage, is not an ingenious device, to sustain a pre-conceived theory, but is forced upon us by the Word of God itself.\*

The hebdomonal division of time during the patriarchal age, affords no proof of a pre-Mosaic observance of the Sabbath; just as the omission of this ordinance in the records of the period between creation and the journey into Egypt, in itself considered, does not prove that the Sabbath belonged to the ceremonial law. Viewed in connection with other circumstances, the absence of any reference, adds weight to the position; but taken by itself, it amounts to nothing. Dr. J. H. Kurtz of Dorpat, in his "History of the Old Testament Covenant," (Vol. 2, p. 109, 110, Eng. Tr.,) declares: "Neither the divine determination in Gen. 2 : 3, to sanctify the seventh day, nor the peculiar form in which it is enjoined in the law, "*Remember the seventh day to keep it holy*," nor the event which prepared for the legal proclamation of the Sabbath, viz.: the fact that no manna fell upon the seventh day, can be appealed to, as yielding decisive testimony in the affirmative; but, on the other hand, we cannot quote these passages as proofs to the contrary, as Hengstenberg has done."

It seems strange, that the word "*Remember*," of the Third Commandment, is so often referred to, as affording decisive proof, that the Sabbath was previously known. It does not require much reflection, to recall instances, in which parents or teachers, in laying down new rules or principles to those in their care, have introduced the declaration, of what has hitherto been unknown, by the word "*Remember*," in order to declare the special importance of what is thus enjoined.

Scripture cannot be made to contradict itself. On this subject, as on all others, there is perfect harmony. The analogy of faith, points us to the true interpretation, "I gave them my Sabbath to be a *sign*." "It is a *sign* between me and the children of Israel." "Let no man judge you, in respect of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come."†

\* Chemnitz in his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, uses these words in explaining a difficulty which some persons had found in Ex. 24 : 7 : "*Sed non animadvertunt, multa per anticipationem, seu per ὑπόθεσιν ἀπορίσπον in historia sacra dici.*"

† "The exclusively legal view, which bases the institution primarily

*Sabbatarianism in its Historical Development.*

A careful examination of Church History, shows us a period, in which the Sabbatarian view was unknown, and the Sabbath and the Lord's Day were considered distinct institutions.\* So, also, again, when the Reformation had purified the Church, the testimony of the Protestants was unanimous on this subject. Whilst the Sabbatarian view was held by the Romish Church, Lutheranism and Calvinism concurred, in maintaining that the Sabbath was an ordinance of the Ceremonial Law, which, in Christ had been abrogated, and that the Lord's Day was to be observed, for other reasons, than that of the direct language of the Third Commandment.

Traces of Sabbatarianism in the Protestant Church, are said to have appeared first in Bohemia; but it did not assume a definite form, until the last decade of the sixteenth century. The greatest laxity in regard to the observance of the Lord's Day, was prevalent, especially in England. One of the homilies of the Church of England, declares that, "God was more dishonored, and the devil better served on the Sunday, than on all the days of the week beside." Viewed by many, merely as a season of recreation and en-

---

and directly on the Fourth Commandment, in the first place, affords no sufficient explanation of the transfer of the Sabbath, from the seventh to the first day of the week, and secondly, is utterly irreconcilable with the clear declarations of the New Testament," Schaff's History of the Apostolical Church, p. 555.

See, also, some very just remarks translated from Dr. Plitt of Bonn; by Rev. J. D. Severinghaus, *Evangelical Review*, Vol. XVIII, p. 170.

\* "It is well known, that in the early ages of the Church, a distinction was made between the Sabbath and the Lord's Day. The former was the Jewish weekly Sabbath, i. e., the seventh day of the week. It embraced the occasional fasts and feasts proscribed by the Mosaic law; cf. Col. 2 : 16; Gal. 4 : 10. Such was the use of the Jewish word *σάββατον*, *sabbaton*. But the early Christians, in order to distinguish this, from the first day of the week, on which they held their religious assemblies, of worship (1 Cor. 2 : 16; Acts 20 : 7,) called the first day *ἡμέρα κυρίου* (Lord's Day), Rev. 1 : 10. Of this distinction, there is clear evidence in the writings of the ecclesiastical fathers. That it was early made even in Apostolic times is evident, from comparing Col. 2 : 16, with Rev. 1 : 10." Prof. Moses Stuart on Rom. XIV : 5.

joyment, it was used by them, as an occasion for rioting and crime. Pious men were shocked at the disregard and contempt of God's Word, which were thus manifested, and they began to consider how the current of ungodliness might be checked. As is so often the case, with those, whose minds revolt at a certain form of error, they rushed to the opposite extreme, and devised a doctrine, by which they hoped to resist the license hitherto prevalent. They were not dishonest; but, in their earnest desire to effect a reformation, and thus advance the cause of true religion, they were led to adopt an expedient, which, no doubt, seemed to them to be right, by which they hoped, that they would be more successful, than by the means hitherto employed. The great leader in this movement, was Dr. Nicholas Bownd, who, in 1595, published his work on the Sabbath, the great object of which, was to show the identity between that ordinance and the Lord's Day. Fearing the popular judgment, the book was first published anonymously, and it was not until after several editions had been exhausted, that the author's name appeared upon the title page. Not only in Great Britain, but, also, in Holland and Germany, the little work attracted considerable attention; and excited bitter controversy. Latent Sabbatarianism, had already imbued many minds, and the sentiments of Dr. Bownd met with a response, in the hearts of many, who, with him, had been led to regard a return to the doctrine of the Romish Church on this subject, as the only refuge. As this doctrine fell in harmoniously with their system, the Puritans, at once adopted it as their own, and endeavored to enforce it with all the Judaic strictness, which they maintained on other points. "It was not till about 1595," says Mr. Hallam,\* "that they began to place it nearly on the footing of the Jewish Sabbath, interdicting, not only the slightest action of worldly business, but even every sort of pastime and recreation, a system which once promulgated, soon gained ground, as suiting their atrabilious humor, and affording a new theme of censure on the vices of the great." "In defiance, says Mr. Macau-

---

\* Constitutional History of England, (Harper's Edition), p. 227. The quotation is made to establish a fact, and not to approve of every sentiment which it expresses.

lay,\* "of the express and reiterated declarations of Luther and Calvin, they turned the weekly festival, by which the Church had from primitive times, commemorated the resurrection of her Lord, into a Jewish Sabbath." In 1625, the Puritans, who were at that time, the prevailing party in Parliament, enacted laws changing the name Sunday, wherever it occurred in the statutes, into Sabbath. "The different appellations of this festival, were, at that time, known symbols of the different parties."† "The use of the word Sabbath, instead of Sunday, became, in that age, a distinctive mark of the Puritan party."‡ The position of the Puritans was greatly strengthened by the fanaticism of James I, who, in order to check the tendency which Puritanism had assumed, made regulations concerning the Lord's Day, which entirely disregarded its sanctity. "He issued a proclamation," says Mr. Hume, "to allow and encourage after Divine service, all kinds of lawful games and exercises: and by his authority, he endeavored to give sanction to a practice, which his subjects regarded as the utmost instance of profanity and impiety." The effect of such conduct, on the part of the sovereign, was only to swell the ranks of the Sabbatarians, by the accession of many Dominicals, who were unwilling to see the Lord's Day thus profaned. In 1648, we find that Sabbatarianism had made such a gain, that it was incorporated into the Westminster Catechism, by which it has since been extensively diffused among the Calvinistic churches.

The leaven was also working elsewhere. We believe Sabbatarianism in the Lutheran Church was developed from within, rather than introduced from without. The term Sabbath, applied in a figurative sense to the Lord's Day, by some of our earlier teachers, gradually lead to a confusion of the two institutions. The treatment of the proper observance of the Lord's Day, under the Third Commandment, inasmuch as it indirectly belongs to the proper consideration of God's Word, contributed to the same end. So, also, did the study of scholastic theology, which was strongly Sabbatarian. In Gerhard we find considerable confusion. He maintains that the Sabbath was, unknown to the patriarchs, but, at the same time, identifies it with the Lord's Day. From him, as we proceed down-

---

\*Macaulay's History of England, Vol. I, Chap. 1.

† Hume, Chapter L.

‡ Hallam, p. 229.

ward, the nearer we approach the era of Rationalism, the more strongly marked becomes Sabbatarianism. We pass through a long line of teachers, most of whom were confessional on every point except this. Many of the so called *dead* orthodoxists, as they were called, were exceedingly strict Sabbatarians. This should be remembered by those who are so fond of maligning our Church on account of her doctrine, concerning the Lord's Day, and who, at the same time, delight in casting upon her reproach, on account of the lives of some of these teachers, who in many things held to the letter, but wanted the true spirit of Lutheranism. Abraham Calov, the most maligned of Lutheran theologians, was a Sabbatarian. Fecht of Rostock, resisted the current, but Schwartz and Mayer were as zealous in attaching Dominicalism, as they were in persecuting Spener. Spener and all the pietists were likewise Sabbatarians. This development of Sabbatarianism on all sides, as we approach the era of Rationalism, seems strange. The teachers who gradually assumed this position, were far removed from Rationalism; nor dare we regard Rationalism, in any way, a result of Sabbatarianism. Sabbatarianism was rather a symptom, which was marking the gradual decline of the Church. The spiritless formalism of dead orthodoxy, and the intense subjectivity of Pietism, alike prepared the way for the Infidelity which followed, and were alike characterized by a departure from the faith of the Church, concerning the Lord's Day. The fact that Rationalists were not Sabbatarians, does not prove that this position is incorrect. With the adoption of Sabbatarian views, by some of our earlier teachers, a beginning was made of that sundering of the Church from the Confessions, which at last ended in so great evil. As truth is a connected whole, the weakening of a single link affects the entire chain. The teachers themselves remained orthodox, but a latitudinarian tendency gradually grew up among their pupils, who, from generation to generation, developed what their teachers had begun.

It is a grievous mistake, to apply a wrong argument, in support of a true position. The truth which we thus attempt to defend, is thereby weakened far more than the error which we attack. God's weapon for overcoming that which opposes him, is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Strongly attached, as we may be to the doctrine of the Trinity, we would do wrong to urge 1

John 5 : 7, as an argument : for scriptural as is the doctrine there inculcated, the passage is spurious, and appealing to it, is making such an addition to the words of Revelation, as the Scriptures condemn. Advocates as we may be of the true presence of the glorified body of Christ in the Holy Supper, it would be wrong for us to endeavor to convince others of the truth of our position, by an appeal to the sixth chapter of John, as no reference is there made to the sacrament of the altar, but only to spiritual communion with Christ by faith. Desirable as we may believe total abstinence to be, we dare not attempt to maintain our position, by tearing from their connection the words, "Touch not, taste not, handle not," or by contending that the wine of the New Testament could not intoxicate. Nothing is gained by handling the Word of God deceitfully. The whole counsel of God is to be declared. Nothing is to be withheld, nothing concealed, nothing added. God himself will take care of his truth. If men will pervert and abuse it, when declared, this is not our fault. We must not rush to the Lord's rescue with weapons of our own. Sabbatarianism in its origin in the Protestant Church, resembles many other attempts at Reformation, which have been made by striking at the branches, instead of at the root of error. The desecration of the Lord's Day, should not have been regarded the sin, against which the Church was to array herself. The contempt of God's Word, was the crime which should have been charged against those, who thus despised the ordinances of God's house, and the preaching of the Gospel. Regard for the day, for any other reason, than from respect of the Word, with which it is occupied, is an abomination to the Lord ; and, hence, we are to insist not so much upon the day as the Word, not so much upon the seventh portion of time, as the true spiritual Sabbath, which comprehends all time. Once lead a man to keep the true spiritual Sabbath, and you will find no difficulty, in inducing him to observe such seasons as the Church has set apart for her services, and the Lord has sealed with his marks of approval.

*Sabbatarianism in its Doctrinal and Practical Relations.*

Sabbatarianism, especially in its Puritanic form, is nothing else than another phase of the same tendency, which was manifested by the Judaizing teachers in the early



Christian Church. They feared the freedom of the Gospel, as they apprehended that it might degenerate into licentiousness; and, therefore, preferred to cling to all the ordinances of the Ceremonial Law, and to require their strict observance by others. It involves the same error, as that against which the Apostle Paul so earnestly strove in the Epistle to the Galatians, such a mingling of the Law with the Gospel, such a putting of new wine into old bottles, as to render hopeless all justification either by the Old or New Dispensation. What Augustine said concerning certain Pelagian teachers of his day, has been well applied to the adherents of some of the more rigid forms of Sabbatarianism, *Dum volunt esse et Judaei et Christiani, nec Judaei nec Christiani potuerunt*. Especially is this attempt to engraft many of the ordinances of the Ceremonial law, upon the Gospel manifest in Puritanism, with its preference for the Old Testament above the New, with its conversion of the sacraments of the New Covenant, into emblematic ordinances less significative than those of the Old, with its burdening of the conscience, with a system of casuistry eminently suggestive of the exactions of those, to whom the conduct of the Saviour was an offence,\* and with its merciless severity towards all those who transgressed its prescribed rule of right.

Professedly, no two systems are farther apart than Puritanism and Romanism. So far as the externals of religious worship is concerned, their position is directly opposite. But the same idea of asceticism permeates both. In Romanism, we find it, in a grosser form; in Puritanism, in a form more refined and subtle. The rigid austerities of the Puritans, like the penances of the Papists, are founded upon the principle, that self-denial and suffering, for their own sake, without reference to any benefit, thereby conferred upon the individuals own character, or upon others, are well-pleasing to God. Asceticism thus prac-

\*The following extreme case will illustrate this. Dr. Hessey quotes it from the records of the Presbytery of Strath-bogie, June 6th, A. D., 1658: "The said day Alexander Cairnie, in Tillichoche, was delatit for brak of Sabbath, in bearing ane sheep upon his back from the pasture to his own house. The said Alexander compeirit and declarit it was of necessitie, for saving of the beast's lyfe in tyme of storme. Was rebukit for the same, and admonished not to do the lyke."—Bampton Lectures for 1860, p. 217.

ticed, obscures the doctrine of Justification by faith, as it teaches, that man himself must suffer for his sins, in order to win God's favor, or prepare himself for God's grace. No one who holds this strict Sabbatarian view, actually makes the "Sabbath" his delight. The restraint which it imposes upon him, is by no means agreeable; but, he comforts himself with the thought, that suffering thus endured belongs to the design, for which God has instituted this ordinance, and, therefore, he bears the burden, esteeming it a means of grace, whereby the Lord will bestow upon him spiritual blessings.

Sabbatarianism co-incides with the idea of a separation, between the kingdoms of nature and of grace, which characterizes the whole of the Calvinistic system.\* It cannot conceive of such a union of the natural and the spiritual, that the two can continually and harmoniously co-operate. It imagines a constant and inherent opposition between them. It cannot understand the principle which makes all actions, all thoughts, all time holy. Hence, the spiritual Sabbath, which makes all days in themselves alike, is an anomaly to Puritanism. Practically it denies, that the six days of labor are also holy; and whilst it does not directly teach so, yet indirectly it proclaims the doctrine, that God asks only one-seventh of our time for his service, that serving him one day in seven is honor enough, and that the remainder he permits us to use for ourselves; thus strikingly harmonizing with the periodical religion, so prevalent in some quarters.

Hence, the observance of the Sabbath which Puritanism enjoins, requires on the Lord's Day, such a separation of the soul from itself, such an absorption in divine contemplation, such "an imageless devotion bare and abstract," as is an utter impossibility under the circumstances of the present life. Prolonged ecstatic contemplation of this

---

\* Calvin, it is true, was not a Sabbatarian, but the principles which he maintained, necessarily led to Sabbatarianism. The genius of Puritanism required, either an abandonment of the Lord's Day, or a resting of its claims upon the Third Commandment. For with the exception of Ordination, the Puritans abolished all useful church-rites, not directly enjoined by Scripture, such as Confirmation, the Church year with its festivals, sacred act in the house of God, etc. The latter alternative was, therefore, adopted, and Sabbatarianism became a characteristic feature of the Calvinistic system.

kind, can be enjoyed only in the world to come. Our religion, too, does not allow such a divorce of the concrete from the abstract. It respects man's entire nature, body, soul and spirit, in all his relations to God, to the Church, the family, the state, to himself. Its object is to pervade all the circumstances of these relations, with the life in Christ. The labor of the week thus belongs as fully to God's service, as the rest of the Lord's Day. What God has thus sanctified, we dare not call common, or unclean. "What God has joined together, let no man put asunder."

*Design of the Ceremonial Sabbath.*

Against this position, the argument may be urged, that if we declare such to be the tendency of Puritanic Sabbatarianism, we must, also, make the same charge, against the Sabbath of the Old Dispensation. But, in the first place, we must recollect, that even the Jewish Sabbath did not demand such a strict observance, as that enjoined by the stricter Sabbatarians, in the Christian Church. Rabbinical tradition had imposed many exactions, in reference to this ordinance, which the Law never commanded. The design of Christ in showing, that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, was to explain the true design of the Jewish Sabbath, and to remove from it all human additions, with which it had been burdened. The days of the Old Dispensation did not end, until the death of Christ had completed all the types and shadows which prefigured his office and work. Our Lord, therefore, in his active obedience undertaken for us, was subject to all the requirements of the Law, both Moral and Ceremonial. Hence, his comparative freedom in regard to the Sabbath, shows that such liberty was consistent with the strictest requirements of the Old Testament.

Yet the law of commandments contained in ordinances, even when stripped of all human additions, was still a burden—a yoke, which neither the Apostles, nor their fathers were able to bear. The best way to convince a man of his weakness, is to lead him to attempt the performance of what is beyond his power. This was one of the designs of the Ceremonial Law. Man was to be humbled, and to be taught his own helplessness, before God would interfere for his relief. In Hehthenism, we see God leaving man to devise for himself, various ways of salvation, the failure of all of which, lead to an earnest longing for redemption.

In Judaism, on the other hand, God devised and prescribed a way, in order to teach man human inability to work out righteousness, even by a way of divine appointment. After the entrance of sin, salvation by the Moral Law was hopeless. Man himself felt the necessity for another way, a way by which a satisfaction might be rendered for sin. The Ceremonial Law was therefore given. In man's original strength, it might have been fulfilled; but the weakness which followed sin, rendered this an utter impossibility. Thus was taught the necessity for still another way. Man was led to see still more of the divine plan for his rescue. He was made to feel, not only that a satisfaction for sin was necessary, and that this satisfaction must be of divine appointment, but, also, that God himself must make it. In this manner, the burden of the Law forced men to the Gospel, the Law became the school-master to lead men to Christ. Many of the regulations concerning the Sabbath, were of this character, intended in no way for those who have the fulness of the Gospel; but only for those who, through the darkness of the law, were groping to a knowledge of the way of salvation. Thus one who would conscientiously endeavor to fulfill the requirements contained in Is. 58 : 13, would soon find that in his own strength, refraining on the Sabbath, from doing his own works, or finding his own pleasure, or speaking his own words, was impossible; and would thus be led earnestly to long for that harmony, attained only through the new birth, which makes the works, the pleasure, the words, the very life of the believer one with that of his Saviour.

*Why was the Ceremonial Sabbath binding upon Believers, under the Old Dispensation.*

The question has been started, Why then was the seventh day Sabbath binding upon those who, under the Old Dispensation, by faith in Christ, were already enjoying the true spiritual Sabbath? This inquiry, actually includes under it another, Why was the Ceremonial Law binding upon those, who, under the Old Dispensation, had already been justified by faith in a coming Saviour? We reply: Under the Old Testament economy, the distinction between the Moral and Ceremonial Law, had not as yet been accurately defined; and the precepts of both were equally binding. Those who were justified by faith in a coming

Saviour, therefore, whilst no longer relying upon the Ceremonial Law, as a ground of righteousness, yet felt constrained to obey its precepts, for the same reasons, on account of which, believers, under the New Testament Dispensation, feel the obligation of obedience to the Moral Law. It was God's pleasure, that the fulness of the Gospel should not be enjoyed by those who lived before the coming of Christ. The deliverance which was to be provided was declared to them, but of the exact nature of this deliverance, they were ignorant. They were assured, that an atonement was to be made for their sins; but *how* this atonement was to be made, was not more than dimly revealed. The treasures of the Gospel, were the blessings, which, under the Old Dispensation, eye had not seen, nor ear heard. The manifestation of the mystery which had been hid from ages and from generations, which prophets and righteous men had desired to see and saw not, and desired to hear and heard not, which even angels had desired to look into, made the blessings of the least under the New, greater than those of the greatest under the Old Dispensation. Just as under the present economy, the consciousness of sin, to which the Moral Law bears witness, leads even those who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, to groan within themselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body; so, also, the knowledge of salvation, not yet perfected, to which the Ceremonial Law bore witness, intensified the unutterable longing of the soul for the completion of God's promises. The more heavily the burdens of Mosaic ceremonies, pressed upon them, the more ardently did they desire the coming of the Consolation of Israel. Thus with faith begotten by the Gospel contained within the Law, so weak that the Apostle accounts it as nothing, when compared with faith, which was afterwards imparted, believers were kept under the Law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. "The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors, until the time appointed of his father. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world; but when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. \*

\* \* \* \* \* Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God. Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service to them, which are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage. Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain," Gal. 4 : 1-4 ; 7-10.

Finally, the tendency of Puritanic Sabbatarianism, is not only to lead its adherents to work righteousness, but also to do a positive injury to others. The austerity, with which they believe that the Lord's Day should be observed, is so strenuously insisted upon, that the idea is conveyed, that the essence of religion consists in such Sabbatizing. The practical effect of this opinion has thus been stated by Mr. Conybeare : \* "The Puritans have always enforced this religious privilege of the advanced Christian, as if it had been a command compulsory on all men. And they have enforced it, moreover in its negative and prohibitory aspects; where they could, by penal laws; everywhere, by damnable denunciations. Thousands are thus alienated from piety, by associating it from their earliest childhood, with a day of gloom and restriction, imposed upon them by arbitrary force. The child is father to the man, and a childhood thus trained too often fathers a manhood of impiety. \* \* \* \* \* Thus the masses are brutalized and degraded, by the attempt to raise them prematurely to a high degree of spiritual advancement."

We have seen that there is also a form of Sabbatarianism, exceedingly mild, and pervaded throughout by the spirit of Gospel liberty. This must not be confounded with Puritanic Sabbatarianism. Resting, however, upon an unscriptural and unhistorical basis, it must likewise be rejected. The Gospel freedom, by which it is characterized, is inconsistent with its position, that the Lord's Day and the Sabbath are identical institutions. Either the Lord's Day is the Sabbath, or it is not. If it be the Sabbath, all the rites and ceremonies of the Law, connected with the seventh-day rest must be observed; for the Holy Scriptures tell us nothing concerning a Christian Sabbath,

\* Edinburgh Review, 1853.

or a Gospel freedom, in the observance of this ordinance. If it be not the Sabbath, but an institution, which has originated in the present Dispensation, then and then only is it free from the rigor of the Law.

*Unscriptural Forms of Dominicalism.*

We do not support that form of Dominicalism, which, while it rejects the idea, that the Lord's Day is the Sabbath, at the same time esteems it an institution of direct Divine appointment. Those who hold this view, argue that the Apostles were divinely inspired, not only for teaching, but also for regulating the externals of worship, and, consequently, they regard the Apostolic custom of devoting the first day of the week, to the service of religious worship, in the light of a command. The divine sanction, which this Apostolic practice received on several occasions, by the presence of the risen Lord in the assemblies of the disciples, and the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, are referred to as indubitable evidences, that the Apostles were right, and that this custom *must* be adopted by all Christians. Far be it from us to derogate aught from the honor which was thus shown the day of our Lord's resurrection; but Apostolic custom in itself considered, does not make a practice obligatory upon those living in succeeding ages of the Church. The Apostles did not act in everything by Divine inspiration. Even when they did, and manifest tokens of Divine favor sanctioned their conduct, institutions thus established, were not necessarily permanent. The love feasts of the early Church, and the exact arrangement of the externals of worship, and of grades in the ministry (Eph. IV : 11), are not binding upon us. The laying on of hands by the Apostles, was followed by the gift of the Holy Ghost; yet very few Protestants esteem this ordinance as of Divine obligation. Confirmation and Ordination are practiced only as appropriate ceremonies, whereby the Church recognizes as Christians, or as ministers, those who have already received and obeyed a Divine call. The Augsburg Confession (XXVIII : 61—66), attacks this very position: "There are certain marvellous disputations touching the changing of the law, and the ceremonies of the new law, and the change of the Sabbath; which all arose from the false persuasion, that there should be a service in the Church, like to the Levitical; and that Christ committed



to the Apostles and bishops, the devising new ceremonies, which should be necessary to salvation. These errors crept into the Church, when the righteousness of faith, was not plainly enough taught. Some dispute that the observance of the Lord's Day, is not indeed of the law of God, but *as it were* of the law of God; and touching holidays, they prescribe how far it is necessary to work in them. What else are such disputations but snares for men's consciences? For though they seek to moderate traditions, yet the equity of them can never be perceived, so long as the opinion of necessity remaineth. \* \* \*

\* \* \* The Apostles commanded to abstain from blood, Acts 15 : 29. Who observeth that nowadays. And yet they do not sin, who observe it not. For the Apostles themselves would not burden men's consciences, with such servitude; but they forbade it for a time because of scandal." So, also, the Apology, Art. XIV : § 16. "Thus the Apostles for the sake of good discipline, ordained many things in the Church, which were altered in the course of time; but they instituted no ordinances as necessary and unalterable."

Nor does even our Lord's approval in itself considered, make a rite of perpetual obligation, John 13 : 1—12. The purely ecclesiastical phase of Dominicalism, must also be rejected, as the basis upon which it rests, is not scriptural. The power of the Church to add to the requirements of the Holy Word, new rules of faith and life, is one of the great errors, for the subversion of which, Protestantism and especially Lutheranism have striven so earnestly against Rome, Augsburg Confession, Art. XXVIII; Apology, Art. XIV; Appendix to the Smalcald Articles.

#### *Lutheran Dominicalism.*

We believe the position set forth and maintained in the Augsburg Confession, the only one tenable. The Lutheran Church considers the Lord's Day a distinct institution, from the Sabbath of the Third Commandment, and observes it, not from any requirement arising from Apostolic practice, or ecclesiastical law; but solely from other considerations, to which allusion has been made in a previous page of this article. She exalts the Word above the Day, considering the Lord's Day holier than other days only, on account of the Word of God, with which it is occupied—holier, because the Word of God, whereby it is

sanctified, is the source of all the holiness which the other days possess. If any one enjoys the true Christian Sabbath, *i. e.*, the rest of the soul in God, it is because his life has become pervaded by the great truths, which the Lord's Day commemorates. Sunday, dear to her on account of her Lord's resurrection, becomes still dearer, from the fact, that the Lord himself blessed it, with special marks of his favor, and that the good and holy of all succeeding ages of the Church, have devoted it, to united prayer, praise and thanksgiving.

*Objection to Lutheran Dominicalism. Disregard of the Lord's Day in Germany.*

But the argument has been urged against the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Day, that Sunday will not be observed, if we remove from it, the idea of legal obligation. Sincere and well-meaning men have made the same plea against the doctrine of Justification by faith, asserting, that if a righteousness independent of the deeds of the law were proclaimed, good works would not be performed. Thus, Gerhard, in his *Confessio Catholica* narrates, that when the Romish Bishop of Windsor was dying, and another bishop present reminded him, that justification was to be obtained alone through the blood of Christ, the dying man replied, that it was dangerous to open this doctrine to the people, but that it was safe to declare and explain it, to him and those placed in like circumstances.

We are pointed to the manner, in which the Lord's Day is observed on the continent of Europe, as an evidence of the tendency of the doctrine which bases the observance of this institution, upon any other ground, than that of the Third Commandment. But unfortunately for the position thus assumed, Roman Catholic Europe, notwithstanding the Sabbatarian position of the Romish Church, shows far more laxity in the observance of the Lord's Day, than do the States which are under Lutheran control. Paris and Rome stand pre-eminent for the disregard which they pay the Lord's Day. "In Spain and Portugal," it is said, "multitudes rush on Sunday from the Confessional to the bull-fight." The Reformed cities are little better, as may be seen from the following description of a Sunday in Geneva.\* "A pleasure-tour in the steamboats, which are

---

\* Quoted by Dr. Hessey, from Laing's Notes of a Traveller, London, 1842.

regularly advertised for a Sunday promenade round the lake; a pic-nic dinner in the country, and overflowing congregations in the evening, at the theatre, the equestrian circus, the concert-saloons, ball-rooms and coffee-houses, are all that distinguish Sunday from Monday. In the village churches, along the Protestant side of Geneva, the rattling of billiard-balls, the rumbling of the skittle trough, the shout, the laugh, the distant shots of the rifle-gun club, are heard above the psalm, the sermon, and the barren forms of state-prescribed prayer, during the one brief service on Sundays, delivered to very scanty congregations, in fact, to a few females, and a dozen or two old men, in populous parishes, supplied with able and zealous ministers." The looseness, in regard to the proper observance of this institution, then, cannot be the teaching of the Lutheran Church, concerning the abrogation of the Sabbath. It has its origin, not in any particular view, concerning the Sabbath, or Lord's Day, but in the general breaking up of morals, consequent upon wide-spread infidelity. We find it, in the same disregard of God's word, and the preaching of the Gospel, which we have before seen to have originated the Anabaptist view concerning the Lord's Day. Rationalism had infused itself into all churches; even those who most strenuously resisted it, by constant contact, unconsciously to themselves, gradually partook of the infection. A denial, or a weakness of conception concerning the reality and power of practical religion followed, which manifested itself in this external development. Thus Sabbatarianism, originally devised in order to check the improper observance of the Lord's Day, and becoming more and more decided, as we advance towards the era of Rationalism, utterly failed of its object. A resort to means not clearly of Divine choosing, will never further a good end. As might be expected, with the decline of Rationalism in Europe, and the return of the Church to the religion of our fathers, the Lord's Day is more properly observed.

*Does Lutheran Dominicalism make man wiser than God.*

Some who have examined the Lutheran doctrine of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, find a difficulty, in the fact, that whilst our Church affirms, that the Sabbath has been abrogated, she at the same time teaches the importance of a fixed season of rest and worship. "If the Lord's Day

have no foundation in a direct positive command," say they, "you arrogate to yourselves, wisdom and power superior to that of God, by maintaining that any day has claims to a peculiar observance." Such a mode of reasoning proves too much, and, therefore, proves absolutely nothing. With equal propriety, it might be employed against family worship, against stated seasons for private devotion, against the assembling of congregations in church edifices, against infant baptism, against the admission of female members of the Church to the Lord's table, in fact, against any institution, or rite, or custom, or rule, not directly and specifically commanded in the Holy Word. No difference how necessary a rule may be to the fulfilment of a general principle which God has enjoined upon us, if such rule be not particularized in express words, consistency with the line of reasoning, employed in this objection, would compel us to deny its importance.\* The regulation of the minutiae of Divine worship, belonged to the Ceremonial Law. In the Gospel, God lays down certain principles, but does not enjoin the details, except where the foresight and sanctified experience of the Church, cannot reach the case. Under all other circumstances, the commandment connected with the injunction of the principle, is simply, Let all things be done decently and in order. In the case under consideration, the general command given, is, to worship God, not to neglect the assembling of ourselves together, to participate in united public prayer, to preach the word, to hear the word, to administer and receive the holy sacraments. To accomplish these ends, the Church, in her Christian liberty, must set apart some time. The Lord's Day she has chosen. All objections urged against the selection of Sunday, must apply also to any other day which could have been designated, whether it had been every seventh, or every fifth, or every second, or every tenth day, or every seventh hour, or seventh week. There must be some specific application of the

\* Quando disputatur de iis quae habent testimonium in verbo Dei, intelligenda esse non illa tantum, quae totidem literis et syllabis in Scriptura extant, sed illa etiam, quae ex certa et manifesta Scripturae sententia, bona consequentia deducantur. Et si talia intelligerent mandata, nulla esset controversia; sunt enim non minus divina mandata, quam quae totidem literis et syllabis in Scriptura expri-muntur.—Chemnitz, Ex. Con. Tri., De Bonis Operibus.

general principle involved in these commands; and every one which could be made, is alike subject to this charge. If the adherents of the Lutheran doctrine concerning the Lord's Day, arrogate to themselves a wisdom superior to God, by esteeming as useful and important, and, therefore, weekly observing what he has not directly enjoined; so, also, do all Christians who make use of any other prayer, than the formula which the Lord himself has given. But the Lutheran doctrine does not make man wiser than God. On the contrary, the wisdom of God is exhibited, in not burdening the Church with irksome details of ceremonies, but in leaving to Christian liberty, the devising and observance of such externals of worship, as administer to the growth of the spiritual man. Neither is the Church inconsistent in assigning to many of the details of worship, which, in the exercise of this liberty, she has adopted, a rank above mere *adiaphora*. "For, although such customs, are by their nature left free, in so far as God has neither enjoined nor prohibited them, yet they become necessary, each in its kind, not as if necessary to salvation, but for the purpose of maintaining order."\*

*Relation of the Doctrine of the Lord's Day, to the Lutheran System.*

The difference between Lutheranism and other systems of doctrine, popularly styled evangelical, does not consist in a divergence on a few unimportant points, but in tendencies of vast and far-reaching importance. Our Confessors adhering closely to the Gospel, never conceded that our Church was only one denomination among many others, a sort of *primus inter pares*; but emphatically affirming in the conclusion of the Augsburg Confession, that they received nothing contrary to Scripture, or to the Catholic Church, thus declared for all time, that, so far as others differed from the Augsburg Confession, just so far was their teaching unscriptural, and they themselves outside of the true Catholic Church. Whilst in every communion which confesses and teaches the doctrines of the three oecumenical creeds, there are many true Christians, yet our Confessors thus affirm that there is no church evangelical in the full sense of the term, but the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and that they only belong to this

---

\* Hutter's Compend, p. 159.

Church, who "hold nothing contrary to" "those things which have been enumerated," in the Confession.\* What they thus declared, has, in all succeeding ages, borne the test of that sole and infallible rule, by which all tenets must be tried, and all doctrines and teachers judged. Consequently, when we proceed from a consideration of other systems of faith, to that which is found in our Confessions, we find the latter characterized by a consistency, to which the former are strangers. Like Scripture, it is full of mystery, it contains many seeming paradoxes; but like Scripture, it is also free from all contradictions. One with Scripture, in it and in it alone, we find a beautiful symmetry, "the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth." Thus the Lutheran or Scriptural (for we believe these two terms to be convertible) doctrine of the Lord's Day, is in striking harmony with the doctrines of the Church, on other articles of faith. Compare it, for example, with the doctrine concerning the ministry. Just as the Lutheran Church teaches, that the true Christian Sabbath comprehends all the days of the believer's life, so, also, she has always firmly maintained the universal priesthood of believers, rejecting the idea, that, under the present dispensation, any ecclesiastical power has been conferred upon a special order of men, apart from what has been conferred upon the entire Church. But, inasmuch as confusion would be produced, if every member would attempt to exercise all the functions which belong to him as an individual Christian, and as the prosperity of the Church is materially advanced by having certain persons who concentrate their time and energies upon the ministry of the Word, the Church, in the exercise of her Christian liberty, following Apostolic custom divinely sanctioned, selects from her number, bishops or pastors, to whom, as to her representatives, she delegates the use of certain functions, which belong to the Church as a whole; just as the Church, in the exercise of the same Christian liberty, in like manner, following Apostolic custom divinely sanctioned, selects, from the Christian Sabbath, a fixed day of the week, which she devotes to a service, not more holy in itself considered, but

---

\* See conclusion of Augsburg Confession, § 5.

more holy in virtue of the relation which it sustains to that which sanctifies all days.

So, also, the Lutheran Church has always contended for the Scriptural doctrine of the parity of all ministers; whilst at the same time, for the sake of good order, she has recognized the practical necessity for a certain conventional priority, by which some are designated as *primi inter pares*.

The New Testament doctrine of holy places is similar. God no longer confines his worship to a particular locality. Neither at Jerusalem, nor on Mount Gerizim, is the only consecrated shrine; but in every place, incense may be offered to his name, and a pure offering. Yet for order's sake, certain places must be designated, where those who worship the Father, may worship Him in Spirit and truth, through the holy ordinances of his house. He who refuses to observe the Lord's Day, because all time is to the Christian alike holy, holds a position in every way as untenable, as that of one who would neglect to attend public service, upon the ground that every place is holy.

Whilst, therefore, there is no identity, there is yet an analogy, between the ceremonies of the Old Testament, and those observed by Christians under the New. The Lord's Day corresponds to the Sabbath, the Easter season to that of the Passover, Whitsunday to Pentecost, the Christian ministry to the Jewish priesthood, and the Christian house of worship, to the Jewish temple.

Martensen remarks: "The Reformed Church, although vigorously protesting against the legal Church of Rome, is nevertheless infected with the legal spirit; whereas the germ of the fulness of the Gospel is found in Lutheranism." In no place is this more prominent, than in the doctrine concerning the Lord's Day. Whilst Antinomianism imagines sanctification complete with justification, and, hence, rushes into licentiousness, denying the co-operation of the believer with the Holy Spirit, in the development of personal holiness; and whilst the tendency of Puritanism, is to teach that justification is not complete in the present life, and that, therefore, notwithstanding the believer's reception into grace, there still remains such an antagonism between him and God, as to conflict with the idea of a perfect reconciliation, until not only the guilt, but also all the infection of sin, be removed: the Lutheran Church, on the other hand, acknowledges that believers



are not perfectly and entirely renewed in this world, and, hence, need the law as a rule of life; but, on the other hand, regards all Christians, entirely removed from the curse and condemnation of the Law, and for Christ's sake, as perfectly reconciled to God, as if they had never sinned. "Thus," says the Form of Concord, "they are never without Law, and yet they are not *under* but *in the law*, living and walking in the law of the Lord, and yet performing nothing through constraint of the law." Hence, in the New Testament Church, we find a simplicity of faith, an ardor of love, a cheerfulness of obedience, instead of the fear and bondage and gloom of the Old Dispensation. This accounts for the joyous spirit of Lutheranism. Firmly relying upon the assurance that, As far as the East is from the West, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us, and transported with delight in the consciousness of the love of Him whose favor is better than life, all her services and all her utterances are pervaded by such a spirit of joy and freedom, as have made her a wonder to many, who have not clearly apprehended the nature of the righteousness which is by faith. Hence, to her, the Lord's Day is not a day of gloomy constraint, a season in which a man is to afflict his soul. Such a celebration of Sunday, she would condemn, as did Jerome: "Fasting may be excusable on the Sabbath, but to fast on the Lord's Day, is a grave scandal." To her the Lord's Day, is a day of rejoicing, as it is a period, on which freed from the restraint of the week, she commemorates the most joyful events in her history, those which center around her Lord's giving "himself for her, in order to present her to himself, a glorious Church not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." It tells her of the victory, which for her he won. It marks the triumph which he celebrated over her conquered foes, when having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly.

"My Saviour's face made there to shine,

His rising did thee raise.

This made thee heavenly and divine,

Above the common days."

## ARTICLE III.

## COMMUNION WITH GOD.\*

By J. FEW SMITH, D. D., NEWARK, N. J.

The theme on which I propose to address you, is a very personal one, and, as I think, of great practical importance. You need not be counselled by me, with reference to your studies, and modes of pursuing them. Nor is it fitting, that I should now speak to you of the nature of that ministry, towards which you are looking; of the qualifications for it, the demands of this wakeful and intelligent and active age upon it, and the best method of gaining for it the largest and most enduring success.

And yet, perhaps, that of which I speak will be found to be intimately related to all these.

My theme is *Personal Communion with God*.

History, or tradition, has preserved for us the saying of the Athenian Solon, KNOW THYSELF, as one of the sentences of wisdom. He who attempts to heed this counsel in the spirit of it, will, indeed, have a life-long study; but will find himself gaining not only knowledge of himself, to make him humble, and vigilant, and self-restrained, but, also, an acquaintance with mankind at large, that may endow him with a mighty power over them. He who knows himself, knows his fellowmen, and should be filled with widest charity towards them; knows what men are, and what they need, and how to touch the springs that move them. There is an acquaintance with men, that is to be acquired only by mingling with them, a practical understanding and power, which come only by participation in the affairs of practical life. Society, the wide world with its multiform interests, and exhibitions of humanity, is a school for the study of human nature, of whose enlarging, sharpening, polishing education, we should all wisely avail ourselves. But to realize its full value, we need to carry with us habits of reflection and self-study. We may see

---

\* An Address to a company of Theological students.

vastly more of the world, than did Homer's famous man, who

"Wandering from clime to clime, observant strayed,  
Their manners noted, and their states surveyed,"

and yet be ignorant of many of the profound things of human nature. The quiet, honest, self-investigation, shows what man is. History, the observation of the outer life, is understood by help of the light within.

But there is a higher maxim than that of the Greek philosopher, higher, because, divine: **KNOW GOD.** And this includes the other; implies, necessitates it.

This does not mean, of course, the full comprehension and measurement of God. In this sense, no man can know Him. But it is among the grandest of all our privileges and prerogatives, that we may so know Him, as to have springing in our hearts, along with profoundest reverence, the feeling of confidence in Him, and the personal appropriation of Him as our friend: know Him, not as you know the geography of your country, or the map of mental science, or a complete theological system, but as you know the wisdom and excellence of a person towards whom your heart turns, and in personal relation to whom you find a constant source of richest strength and gladness: know Him as you know a human person, yet with infinitely richer heights and depths of admiration, and trust, and love. You know no human being perfectly. Judge him however correctly, understand him however thoroughly, love him however deeply, there are depths in him you can never penetrate, there are riches of love and of moral beauty, there are powers of affection, capacities for emotion and for action, utterly immeasurable by us. Still more must this be true of Him, who concentrates in Himself all of good, and of power found in man, made by Him in His own image, and infinitely transcends it all. And yet, as your heart goes out towards your human friend, and you know him as yours, so may you know God. And as daily communion with your friend discloses characteristics which deepen your attachment to him, or just of itself, without new disclosures, by the subtle and sweet influence of his presence keeps fresh the glow of friendship, so does daily Communion with God, give us fresh insight into His beauties, and the grandeur of His Excellence, and bring upon us an influence, that deepens and

elevates our reverent affection. We are increased in the knowledge of God.

Paley says: "It is an immense conclusion, that there is a God; a perceiving, intelligent, designing Being; at the head of creation, and from whose will it proceeded." It is a great thing to know that *there is a God*. It is a greater thing to *know God*, and to walk with Him.

It will be your business as theologians, to make yourselves acquainted with the character and will of God, as you may learn them from His inspired Word, and from His works. But what I now commend to you is *Personal Communion* with Him, not as theologians, but as men; knowing God as distinguished from knowing about Him.

This, of course, implies habits of private prayer, and of meditation on God's Word, not with any specific end in view, other than simply to ascertain its meaning, and take in its full influence on your souls. Just here, I think, we all need to be guarded. We are too much in the habit of reading the Bible, for the purpose of establishing our positions; or to get texts or themes for preaching; and not enough in the simple attitude of grateful and reverent listeners to God. We must have hours when we divest ourselves of all official character, or professional and specific ends, and read not for a critical, but for a devotional exercise, not as exegetes, or theologians, or preachers, but as human beings, fallen in sin, blessed by the grace of God in the Redemption by Jesus, listening reverently to hear what God will say, counting it all joy, thus to be brought into Communion with Him.

And so as to *prayer*, in which we talk to God, and our hearts go out actively to Him, the thoughts awakened by His Word, putting themselves in responsive motion towards Him whom we love. The public prayer of an assembly, the social prayer of the smaller meeting, the family prayer,—each is good and indispensable. May the time never come in this Seminary, when the social prayer meeting shall fail to be universally attended, and earnestly sustained. But nothing can be a substitute for *private prayer*. We must have times when we are alone with God. We who are specifically students of religion, need those times as much as the busy men of the world. Our dangers are not the same as theirs; but they may be as great. Certainly his spiritual life cannot be healthy and vigorous, who does not maintain this *personal Communion with God*.

For the best understanding of God's Word, such communion is requisite. He will enter most deeply and surely into the mind of the Spirit, who thus sits with the Spirit, and learns of Him. He who lovingly seeks God, will be in the most favorable state to take the meaning of the Word without prejudice into his soul. He who humbly asks God to be his teacher, will receive guidance; and will also be best fitted and disposed to search for himself into the deep things of God, and to pass on from the milk that nourishes beginners, to the strong meat that gives vigor to the mature man. In this sense, not in any idle or mystic sense, the old saying, *Bene orasse est bene studuisse*, is true and valuable. The prayer helps the study, but does not take the place of it. Light shines upon the student's path, not upon the idler's.

For strength of personal character, such communion affords best hope. He whose soul is nourished at such sources, is strong in a spiritual might. Jacob's strength grew as he wrestled with the angel. So all the muscles and sinews of the soul are hardened, more compactly knit, by such Communion with God. Under its vitalizing influence, Christian graces are developed into rich fruitage; as the clusters of the vine are mellowed and enlarged by the genial rays reflected from the sheltering wall. He who walks with God, is less likely to be troubled with intrusive doubts, or strong allurements. Foulness shrinks from purity. The evil comes not where the good is. Or, if the devil does intrude himself even into sacred precincts, his whispers are answered by the word of Power, that springs instinct with life to the lip. It is in such seasons of solitary and devout Communion with God, that we get a deeper insight into our own defects and characteristics, and gather strength to meet the temptations that assail us. They weave mystic cords that bind our souls to him, and keep us from drifting away into self-indulgence, falling in with the spirit of men, who disregard God, and live for time. How much we need such heavenly helps and restraints, every year of thoughtless life but more clearly proves: while it is a blessed experience, that assures us, these are found in such intercourse with God. Enoch was able to walk untainted, amid the godlessness sensuality that surrounded him, because he walked and with God.

And, then, *this is among the supremest sources of moral power.*

There is a mighty assimilating power in Communion with God. We grow like that we love; like that, also, with which we familiarly associate. Constant beholding of the Lord's glory in a devout spirit, changes us into his image. There is a stamp upon the character of the man who keeps up this Communion with Jehovah, which attracts attention—an influence going from him, that makes itself felt. Moses' face, you remember, shone as he came forth from the sacred audience. The once familiar, but now neglected verses of Cowper, express, perhaps extravagantly, an all important truth:

"When one that holds communion with the skies,  
Has filled his urn where these pure waters rise,  
And once more mingles with us meaner things,  
'Tis e'en as if an angel shook his wings;  
Immortal fragrance fills the circuit wide  
That tells us whence his treasures are supplied."

And thus our souls quickened, strengthened by the life ever flowing in them—that life, of which St. Paul said, "Yet not I, but Christ liveth in me"—we are both *fitted* for the activities of the Christian service, and *impelled* to them.

Now you will not misunderstand me, either as counselling a habit of inactive mysticism, or as confining Communion with God, to hours of prayer and retired meditation. I confess to an admiration of many of those old mystics, whose story forms one of the most painful and most interesting chapters in human experience; bringing to us glimpses of rare beauty, touches of divine sweetness, in the midst of sad extravagance and insane weakness. We are not to go to them for teachers or for models. And yet it might be well, if the bustling, talking, organizing, out-of-doors piety of the present day, would catch some of the sweet self-abnegation, and devout trust, and holy charity, of some of the best of them; only avoiding their grand error of attempting to think God down into their hearts, instead of striving to rise to God by the ladder which He himself let down from heaven for us—the Word: the Word Incarnate, and the Word written. Communion with God, is not idle reverie, or mystic rapture—an hour wasted in contemplation, however ecstatic, that

does not mould or fructify the spiritual life. It implies the active exercise of our own powers, in thought upon God's Word, and in prayer. Even in the physical world, where there is no voluntary action, yet in all that exhibits life and fruitfulness, there is responsive, or coöperative movement. There is something in the seed, that responds to the chemical and other forces, that act upon it from without. The grape, that becomes lucious under the sun's touch, swells from within towards his attraction. The waiting upon the Lord, that renews the strength, is a wakeful, attentive waiting, not laying out the soul before God, as Gideon laid out his fleece upon the rock, for the dew to come upon it. David said, "My soul thirsteth for God," but he did not mean thereby, that he would not try to slake that thirst, by himself drawing water from the well of salvation.

It is related of Arch-Bishop Leighton, that once walking with a friend through his spacious library, when his friend expressed a warm admiration of the goodly collection of noble works, he said, "One holy thought is worth more than all of them." He surely did not mean to interdict study, the diligent use of all the instrumentalities, by which we become acquainted with God, and with ourselves, and acquire power to serve Him usefully among men. The holy thought comes in the active use of our intellectual and spiritual powers.

Prayer is an intelligent and honest opening of the soul to God. And meditation implies active thought. You may be far from personal Communion with God, even when you seem to be alone with Him. Your thoughts, that should be concentrated on Him, may be wandering; or you may waste in idle reverie, what should be intelligent action of the soul praising Him, and learning of Him. There is reason to fear, that much "private devotion," is listless, and, therefore, fruitless; reverie, rather than communion.

An art-student once said, to a great painter, "Pray, sir, may I ask what you mix your colors with?" "With brains, sir," was the gruff reply. There is more than one suggestion in this reply. But I may ask, do not some men seem to think, that in prayer, in so-called devotional exercises, their *brains* are not needed? That they may come empty



before God? There is no communion without thoughtfulness; and that implies themes of thought and thinking.

And so I would not confine this communion to the hours of private prayer and meditation. It belongs to action also: to Joshua on the battle-field, as well as to Moses with Aaron and Hur; to the lecture, or recitation room, as well as the closet; to the work of the mission, and the stir of society, as well as to the special visit to the mercy seat, or the sweet hour of sitting at Jesus' feet, or of gazing on the cross, or into the opened heaven. In its truest form, it pervades the whole life. It is the life. We ought to be all the time in such Communion with God, that whether we think of Him or not, there shall be an instinctive guiding of our souls in sympathy with Him; there shall be a prompt reference to Him on all occasions of questioning and perplexity, a natural appeal to Him in every moment of need. But in order to do this, there must be seasons of specific private devotion, in which this union with the Lord may be strengthened. And we may greatly fear, that the man who attempts to live without such seasons of prayer, on the ground, that in the liberty of Christ, loving is praying, and working is worship, will forget to pray, and find himself sadly separate from the source of life, his work often unwholesome, and his liberty degenerating into self-indulgence.

The drift, then, of these remarks, brethren, is to urge on you, the cultivation of *Personal Communion with God*. I affectionately and earnestly counsel you to make a heart-work of it. Shut up, as you are, in the sacred retirement here devoted to religious studies, you have doubtless, already learned, that you are not beyond the reach of temptation, or free from moral imperfections, for whose removal you need to strive. Though the grosser forms of the sin which clings to human nature, may not seem likely to trouble you, you are not inaccessible to the ambitions and rivalries, the slothfulness and negligence, the formality and self-righteousness, that often trouble even good men. You may be in danger of turning all your studies into an intellectual curriculum, and giving to your pursuits a merely professional character. And, that you may be guarded against these errors, may form the highest Christian character, may extract the richest sweets from the glorious fields here spread before you, and bive them for the future, I counsel you to keep carefully the hours of retire-

ment, of private Communion with God, on which none, not even your bosom friend, must be allowed to intrude. Of course, these are not to interfere with your studies, which are your great work, the thing for which you are here; nor will they detract from your social services. On the contrary, they will help you in these; help you in your studies, and cause you to enrich every social service, and to be most blessedly helpers of each other, and to bear a useful part in the activities of Christian benevolence and evangelization.

And it is, when I think of the future, that is before you, that I am most anxious that you should form these sacred habits, and be most fully established in them; that you should go forth into the great field of action, linked by living bonds to our living Lord, ever walking with Him, and because walking with Him, working most efficiently among men. Not less of study, or less of work, because of prayer, but study and work all the deeper, richer, more productive.

The age in which we live, is far from being mystical, or even meditative. It is a profoundly awakened and active age. The ministry, that we would send out to it, must not be idle dreamers; nor must they be men of mere professional routine, or intellectual athletics, or literary men. They must not waste their strength in sickly sentimentalism, or devote to the fashioning of vestments, and the fringes of ceremonies, powers that may be employed in sounding the Gospel on dying ears, and raising fallen humanity heavenward. It is eminently a working age: an age of action; of quick growth and changes; of great inquiry and disputation; an age, perhaps, exposed to the dangers of superficiality, of mistaking the glow of external working, for a true spiritual life; when, possibly, the religious life of many, consists more in excitement and doing than in humble communing with God; and an age, which, as just intimated, might be profited by an infusion of the old mystic, or contemplative spirit, and which is in danger of becoming shallow, because of running to the opposite extreme—and yet a noble age! in which there is larger benevolence, wider reach of knowledge, truer science, more universal information, higher civilization, grander activity of thought, more glorious liberty, than the world has ever before seen; in which, while there is, perhaps, a subtler form, if not an open avowal of hostility to Christianity, there is a nobler array of champions, with

grander equipments for defense and conquest, and undoubtedly as fine specimens of earnest, devout, spiritual, Christ-like Christians, as have ever been known. And we would have our young men go forth to the Christian ministry, at such a time, fitted for action; not to be recluses, perfunctory officials, ceremonious priests, but awake to every danger, ready for every duty, working men in a busy world, where the enemy is ever busily at work.

And because we would have you such men, best fitted to do the work, to which you will be called; to cope with difficulties, to preach the truth in Jesus, wise to win souls, wise master-builders in the Church of Christ, we would have you cultivate earnestly *Personal Communion with God*. Let this be the heart of your life; the fountain of your strength. Let its current pervade all your thoughts and doings. Be assured, you will find this for your comfort, for your preservation, for your enlightening, for your sanctifying. And it will be the central, vital force of a truly useful ministry. Not abating, in the least, external activity, it will guard that from error and superficialness. Not allowed to be a substitute for study, it will deepen your knowledge of sacred things, and enrich all your thoughts. Not putting any obstacle in the way of finest culture, or most diligent parochial organizing, it will give you a power in the pulpit, and a commanding influence in your intercourse with men, more to be desired than popular applause, or literary fame. Be assured, that the man who thus habitually communes with God, carries with him a power, for which shining talents can be no substitute, which ennobles talent, dignifying and enlarging its potency, and secures truest success.

I plead for this Communion with God, habitual, going with you always, and in everything. But, I assure you, that for its highest culture, the securing and right using of the hour of private devotion are essential. Surely, we cannot preserve this life of God in our souls, in the midst of the excitements around us, if it be not nourished by private interviews with Him. We may be alone with God in the midst of a crowd, and may pray in our hearts, while our hands are very busy. But, in order to do this, we must at times be truly alone with Him, virtually, if not literally *closeted* with Him. Thus only can we learn to walk habitually with Him, with hearts open to the least intimation of His will, with serene confidence, with alac-

city of obedience, in the Master's spirit coming up to the work of our "hour," that the Father may be glorified in us. Forth from such seasons of holy communion we shall come rejoicing to run our race, and shall take up our allotted work and do it; even as Jesus, coming down from the Mount of Glory, found the demoniac waiting to be healed, and did the work, which his apostles were impotent to perform.

I might readily, young gentlemen, enforce these remarks, by the recorded experience of devout, and eminently useful men. But I need not do this. How can any of us doubt our need of these seasons of retirement to Communion with God, for the peace and refreshing of our souls, and for our preparation for the work given us to do, when we remember how often Jesus, *Immanuel*, went apart, by himself to pray; and how every special act, whether of miracle, or of teaching, or of suffering, was preceded by such a sacred solitude, a hallowed hour of Communion with the Father.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### ECCLESIASTICAL PURITY.

By Rev. H. L. Dox, St. Gasport, N. Y.

Should a minister of the Gospel, guilty of drunkenness, adultery, or other like offences, be continued in, or, if for such conduct, once deprived of, should he ever again be restored to the functions of the sacred office? Are ecclesiastical bodies at liberty to endorse, or re-endorse such men as ministers, and can it ever be consistent or safe for churches to receive and confide in them as Pastors?

Professional apostacies have become alarmingly frequent, and it is not likely, that their frequency will lessen. Neither in the Church, nor out of it, is self-denying morality a characteristic of any age. We are too ambitious of great results, to be very careful about nice distinctions; and our progress is too rapid to justify even the hope of

scrupulous attention to purity. Indeed, increasing laxity has always been a law of human society. Numerous have been the instances of associational degeneracy. Individuals may reform; organizations, as such, never. Better rules may be adopted, and particular rules may be better enforced; but no system of social regulations has been devised, or if devised, has never yet been so reduced to practice, as to prevent deterioration. Liberty is the watch word, which, with many, means licentiousness. Restriction provokes rebellion; toleration affords "occasion to the flesh." Accordingly, as the morality of the profession is liable to the same general influences which regulate society at large, from the nature of things, as ministers multiply, apostacies will multiply.

Not a few of the reckless are yet covetous of the advantages of the holy calling. Some may have made choice of it from honorable motives, but become too corrupt to be controlled by them. Doubtless, in other cases, superficial apprehensions have been succeeded by sorrowful disappointments. Men have entered the ministry with expectations which have not been realized, and, as a consequence, they have practically ignored its obligations. They cling to it as a livelihood, not with a view to usefulness. The safe-guards of purity are thus removed; temptations increase; ambition, appetite, lust, and it may be, want, clamor; and it only remains for the strength of a particular passion, or the weakness of a particular point of character, to determine into what vice they are to fall. Every such instance, whether the result originally of weakness or wickedness, becomes the occasion of danger and of discredit to the cause of Christ.

The subject, accordingly, is neither uninteresting nor unimportant. Apostacies will occur, and the question, how they are to be treated, cannot be avoided. Nor should we leave the decision of this question, to be influenced by individual instances. We must have rules even for emergencies, and such rules should be established under circumstances most favorable to calmness and impartiality.

Not with the obstinacy of conceit, but with the firmness of an honest conviction, it is proposed in the present article, to maintain, that any minister, who by crime or vice, once dishonors the sacred office, should be forever excluded from it.

Let the proposition be understood. By *crime* and *vice*, are meant, not *venial*, but scandalous offences; such offences as have been named. Discrimination here is indispensable. If *perfection* is to be the professional standard, all must be excluded; or rather, none would be admitted. If no regard is had to morality, the foundations of the profession are at once subverted. Theoretically to draw the line between *venial* and *scandalous* offences, may be impracticable; to overlook, or ignore the distinction, is impossible. We must, therefore, "hold fast the golden mean." "We have this treasure in earthen," frail, imperfect, but not in vile or corrupted, "vessels." Foibles, indiscretions, eccentricities, should be treated with forbearance, while crime and vice must not be tolerated. In his "folly," Paul invoked the church to "bear" with him; but the anticipated result of not keeping his "body under," was to become a "cast away."

The objections, which may be presumed to lie against the position taken, will first be examined, and then the arguments, by which it is supposed to be sustained, will be stated.

Is it at war with the doctrine of *Forgiveness*? If so, the proposition must be abandoned. The idea of forgiveness is fundamental, or Christianity has no foundation. Nor can we innocently overlook, or practically neglect this duty, whatever may be the combination of circumstances, or the pressure of necessity. Nothing may lessen its scope, or dispute its sway. The errors and evils of depraved human nature, can scarcely transcend the imperative exercise of this divine virtue. Not only "until seven times," but "until seventy times seven," must we willingly, hopefully, joyously, receive the returning penitent to our embrace. And let it be remembered, that the most flagitious offenders may sincerely repent, and find the favor of God. Accordingly, the Church must receive such, and cordially extend to them its privileges. So far at least, all is clear.

But distinctions must be made, where there are differences. To forgive a penitent, is one thing; to elevate him to the highest seat in the synagogue, is another. And the difference between the two things, is so radical and so broad, that the instructions respecting the one, can have no necessary application to the other. The Church may become satisfied, that a fallen pastor has heartily repented

of his sins; but *can* she be satisfied, that his penitence will patch up his ruined reputation? She may, and she should receive him within the fold; she should charitably watch over and encourage him; but is she bound, or is she at liberty, to put him on the "watch tower;" to give him the most public and most responsible station, and leader of the flock? Because we forgive him for the past, must we trust him for the future? Relinquishing the imputation of guilt, must we restore him to forfeited honors and privileges? May not a creditor generously cancel his claims against a delinquent debtor, without placing himself under obligation to become his creditor a second time? A treacherous general, from patriotic motives, may return to the deserted flag of his country; and, with the strictest propriety, he may be sent to the ranks, but it would be a little short of madness to entrust him a second time with the command. And if he is a true soldier, and a true penitent, he will give proof of sincerity, in the humblest sphere, and feel that he has been honored beyond his deserts.

The case then stands thus: We are bound to forgive: but forgiveness does not imply restoration; hence, as a consequence of forgiveness, the Church is under no obligations to restore a dishonored minister to the functions of the sacred office.

Are there any *Scriptural examples* in conflict with this conclusion? The case of David is naturally suggested, though entirely irrelevant. It is true, he was declared to be a man after "God's own heart," the highest commendation mortal ever received. And, it is true, he was sacredly anointed as the divinely appointed ruler of the Lord's chosen people. He fell; fell into the most revolting wickedness. His name was black with guilt, and his hands were red with innocent blood. His sin was very aggravating and very public, yet it was "put away," and evidently with God's approval, he continued to exercise the functions of his high office. But what of it? What has all this to do with the question, whether a fallen, but penitent minister shall continue to be a pastor? David was a king, invested with the sceptre; he was not a priest, waiting at the altar. The successful administration of the government, depended more upon his authority, than upon his reputation; less upon his moral purity, than upon his military power. During that age, at least one of the



crimes he committed, was a matter of connivance because it was so common; and even the other occurred too frequently, to cause much public excitement, especially when the criminal was a powerful sovereign, and the victim an obscure subject. Only Nathan saw the enormity of David's sin; the people were not much disturbed by it. Now, because the royal penitent, though guilty of adultery and murder, was permitted to hold his throne, and to exercise his power, does it follow, that an ambassador of Christ, whose only influence for good depends upon his purity, after indulging in scandalous wickedness, may be allowed to minister in "holy things?" Since God yielded to the wishes of the children of Israel, and granted them a king, civil power and moral purity have seldom been associated in the character of an earthly sovereign. The mightiest monarchs have not unfrequently been the worst of men. But it will be a dark day to Christianity, when the Church ceases to regard the inspired admonition, "Be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord."

The example of Peter, is doubtless the most pertinent. His sins belonged to the class mentioned, and after committing them, he was authorized, by the Master himself, to perform the duties of an apostle. But was Peter, when he denied Christ, a converted man? Christian character commences at conversion, and as affecting reputation, sins previously committed, cannot disqualify for duties subsequently enjoined. Accordingly, unless it can be shown, that Peter was at that time in a regenerated state, the example fails as an objection. And, of course, the burden of proof rests with the party which may urge it as an objection. But as the design is to establish a principle, rather than to silence an antagonist, the point submitted may be negatively considered.

Did Christ, before Peter's apostacy, recognize him as a converted man? In answering this question, but a single text needs to be examined. It is found in Math. 19: 28. "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me in the regeneration." Observe about this text:

1. A wonderful diversity of opinion exists respecting it.

2. The word here rendered regeneration, is applied by different commentators to different transformations, sup-

posed to have occurred at different times; but it is believed, that no writer of note has ever understood it to mean the new creation in Christ Jesus. Bloomfield quotes the opinion of several others, and concurs in it, that this "renovation or new state of things" took place at the promulgation of Christianity, after the resurrection and ascension of Christ; or otherwise, to the "regeneration which was then effected by the Gospel;" and he carries the idea, that it was not a change of a personal character, but in the general condition of affairs.

3. In the sense of a moral renovation, Christ was never *regenerated*, and, hence, it must have been in some other sense, that the disciples "followed him in the regeneration."

Did Peter himself claim to be a converted man? If so, *when, where, and in what way?* Did the life of this apostle, as given in the Gospels, furnish any evidence, that up to this date, he had "passed from death unto life?"

Not only his ignorance, but his radical misapprehensions of the character of Christ, of the object of his mission, and of the nature of his kingdom, clearly sustain the opposite conclusion. He evidently regarded him, as in some sense the Saviour only of the Jewish nation, and as intending to break the power of Rome, and establish himself upon the throne of David. His hope of promotion fired his ambition, and he seems to have had no conception of any other advantages to result from his discipleship. In fact, his unbelief respecting the crucifixion and resurrection of the Saviour betrayed something more than the usual obstinacy of human depravity, and rendered him liable to the severe and suggestive rebuke, "Get thee behind me Satan, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of man."

Nor is there in the life of Peter hitherto any particular event, to which so important a change in his heart and habits may be traced. On the contrary, his history from the date of his discipleship, until his denial of his Master, furnishes a noticeable similarity. Everywhere, and upon every occasion, he manifested the same narrowness in his views, the same selfishness in his aspirations, the same petulance in his temper, and the same rashness in his acts and utterances.

But what is most satisfactory, perhaps, on the pending question, is the *contrast between his life before, and after, his*

*apostacy*. And a single illustration may suffice, though several might be given.

Allusion has already been made to Peter's obstinate unbelief in regard to the crucifixion and resurrection. The account is found in Matt. 16 : 21—23. The transition which he here underwent was sudden and extreme. The direct personal commendation which Christ bestowed upon him—"Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona"—in view of his noble confession—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"—had greatly gratified his feelings and excited his hopes. But the startling announcement which immediately followed, that Jesus was soon to "be killed, and be raised again the third day," at once crushed his feelings and his hopes. If this was to be so, if Christ in a short time was to die at Jerusalem, how was his kingdom to be established, and what was to become of the lofty aspirations of this ambitious disciple? The disappointment was more than he could endure, and he faced his Master and disputed the sorrowful prophecy. "Be it far from Thee, Lord: this shall not be unto Thee." This disputations unbelief subjected him to the rebuke already noticed.

Now, let any discriminating person study the indications of the "carnal mind," as here brought out, and then turn to Acts 2, and read the wonderful representation which this "Prince of the Apostles" gives of the sufferings, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ; his explanations of the prophetic foreshadowings of these fundamental truths; the startling effects which he ascribes to them, and his own unflinching faith in them, as the only means of salvation to lost sinners; and then say, whether, somewhere between the two occurrences noticed, Peter had not emerged from darkness to light, from a stubborn unbelief to a triumphant and saving faith! Conditions of mind and heart, so directly opposite, could not have been experienced by the same person, without an intermediate change of the most radical character.

It does seem then, that Peter's great sin was committed while he was yet in a sinful state. And this fact, of itself, is sufficient to dispose of his example as an objection to the proposition under consideration. But there is yet another fact, of at least equal weight, which must not be forgotten, though it may be stated in very few words.

Ministerial reputation and responsibility cannot exist back of ministerial commission. An office can only be

disgraced by those who have been entrusted with its functions. At the time Peter denied Christ, he had not received the apostolic commission. Hence, his shameful apostacy brought no disgrace upon the sacred office, nor did it, according to the principle assumed, disqualify him for the performance of its functions.

The example of Peter, then, stands thus: His denial of Christ was, indeed, a scandalous offence; but, at the time, he was neither a converted man, nor a commissioned apostle: therefore, his sin was no disgrace to the sacred office, nor does his subsequent recognition, as an ambassador of Christ, constitute an objection to the proposition, that an apostate minister of the Gospel should be forever excluded from the ministry. Here we leave the objections which it was supposed might be urged, and immediately proceed to the direct argument.

It is worthy of notice, that the Jewish Priesthood was peculiarly guarded against the *imperfect* and the *impure*. The duties enjoined, and the manner in which those duties were to be discharged, are detailed with remarkable particularity. Yet, there is no distinctive classification of the sins, or the penalties, to which the priests, as such, were liable. The reason, doubtless, is to be found in the fact, that there was so little discrimination between the civil and religious, in that peculiar economy. The sanctions of the general code, were evidently sufficiently diversified and severe to prohibit, or punish offences of even a sacrilegious character. Upon this point, it is enough to know, that the excommunicated "were perpetually excluded from all the rights and privileges of the Jewish people." And, that the Priesthood, when guilty of any abuse of the sacerdotal functions, was not exempt from the severest inflictions, is proved by the fearful fate of Nadab and Abihu. So far, therefore, as the Aaronic system bears upon the subject under discussion, it sustains the view sought to be enforced.

The Great Teacher has not described as fully as might have been expected, the character he would have his servants maintain, nor has he given directions how his Church should treat those by whom that character is dishonored. Ecclesiastical troubles have, indeed, a place in the records of the first Christian churches; but, happily, though indiscretions and misunderstandings among the ministers of Christ make up a part of the inspired narra-

tive, no cases of pastoral or apostolical apostacy are found there. The most particular instruction, which the New Testament furnishes respecting ministers, is contained in Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus. Here are specifications in regard to Bishops and Elders, which are definite, direct and very comprehensive. When we read, for example, that a Bishop must be of "good behaviour" and "blameless," we know it is implied, that he must not be guilty of crimes or immoralities. And yet, should a case of scandal occur, from such expressions no rules can be derived, respecting the manner in which it should be treated. But there is one requisition added, which is suggestive of relief. A Bishop "must have a good report of them which are without." And this statement is without any qualification. That he "must have a good report," is just as indispensable, as that he "must not be a brawler," or "given to much wine." And, as we find so little, which, by expression or implication, will subserve our purpose, let this text be carefully scrutinized.

1. A Bishop "must have a good report"—reputation—name—among those "which are without"—that is, persons not within the Church—not Christians, unbelievers.

2. This "good report," is necessary, for two reasons at least; as an element of power, and "lest he fall into reproach, and the snare of the devil."

3. If a minister of the Gospel fall into disgraceful wickedness, it is evident, from the statement itself, as well as from the nature of things, that he loses, and can never regain his "good report." (a.) His wickedness will never be forgotten. (b.) The injury inflicted, will continue to be felt. (c.) Such wickedness, followed by such consequences, will always occasion scandal. (d.) Penitence in such cases, especially among those "which are without," must be liable to suspicion. (e.) In such a state of things the "snare" will be unavoidable. A man, so situated, must be something more than human, if he is not driven to conceal, to palliate, to equivocate, to deny the dark and exceptionable facts in his history. And with such accusations, growing out of such facts, as he must encounter, how can he escape sensitiveness, irritability and resentment?

No servant of Christ can carry his "good report" through apostacy; hence, if he fall, he should never return to the ministry.

Vice or crime, in a character developed and matured, is unmistakable proof of some constitutional, or habitual deflection of such unyielding obstinacy, that neither education, nor grace has reached, or remedied it. Sudden and strong temptation only develops; it can never create the evil. Yielding to temptation, under such circumstances, shows that there was a preparation for it. And if, with such culture, as a minister of the Gospel is supposed to possess, with such restraints as are thrown around such a position, he is once overpowered, though his moral nature may rally under the reaction, yet there can be no security, that succeeding temptations will not be followed by similar results. It is a well established principle, that yielding at the same time strengthens temptation and weakens the power of resistance. Accordingly, the victim is subject to a double disadvantage, and there is a corresponding probability, that his thralldom will be occasional, if not permanent. Is it claimed, that *peculiar circumstances* may render temptation resistless? Be it so; what assurance can be given, that *peculiar circumstances* will not occur in the future, as they have in the past? Should so fearful a risk be incurred against the chances? Should the sanctity of the profession, and the safety of the Church be placed in jeopardy, with such probabilities against them? May the sacred interests of Christ's cause, and the honor of his name, be entrusted to hands which have already betrayed them, upon the frail hope, or the bare possibility, that a weak, or a wicked man, amid all the fluctuations and uncertainties of the future, may never again be tempted as he has been, and repeat the criminality of which he has already shown himself capable? What ecclesiastical body, what church is prepared to assume such responsibilities?

That *past infamy is incompatible with present fidelity*, is clearly involved in what has been said, and is too obvious to require more particular proof or illustration. How can a minister of the Gospel preach against sins, of which, as a minister, he has been guilty? How can he deal with the numerous and offensive violations of the seventh commandment, when his professional reputation is blackened with the sin of adultery? How can he denounce intemperance, while drunkenness makes up a part of his ministerial record? How can he look his audience in the face, as a ministerial thief, and say, "Thou shalt not steal,"

~~then their returning on~~ sends to his heart the taunt,

"Dost thou steal?" Under the ministrations of such a man, the most revolting iniquity will escape exposure, or the guilty will shield themselves against rebuke, by the Master's own proverb, "Physician heal thyself."

Nor this alone. The Church with such a pastor is powerless in opposing vice. They must be confused and silent, or subject to distressing and paralyzing embarrassment. They stand committed, and if they respect the man of their choice, consistency requires, that they shall not revive the memory of his wrongs by arraying themselves against similar wrongs of others. With their hands thus tied, they are disqualified for aggressive and reformatory labors. And the interests of the Church are not likely to fare much better. No people can entrust their spiritual affairs to such guardianship, without fear and reserve, fatal to the purposes of the pastoral relation. Many secret workings of the heart are matters of doubt and anxiety, to be relieved, only by the discriminating counsel, which a confidential pastor alone is supposed to be able to give. And, surely, none but the eye of purity should be allowed to look into the heart. How can an intelligent mother, for example, with all her sensitiveness and jealous solicitude, send a guileless and unsuspecting daughter to a man for religious instruction and advice, whose past licentiousness is public notoriety? And to a greater, or a less extent, similar embarrassments are felt by all.

Is it claimed, that these objections are serious, only so far as a man's wrongs are known, that fleeing from the sphere of his guilt, his usefulness need not be impaired? Vain hope! the attempt has often been tried, and always proved a failure. It is about as easy to hide away from the divine Omnipresence, as from a ruined reputation. And were it practicable, it would not be honorable. To conceal antecedents, known to be objectionable, as a means of securing position and influence, is downright deception. A minister must be honest respecting his own history. Churches generally act upon the presumption, that ministers are good men, especially if ecclesiastically endorsed. And, acting upon this presumption, if a church is imposed upon by some Reverend renegade, who has escaped the brand of ecclesiastical justice, and distanced the flight of his sullied reputation, the least that can be said, is, they suffer, because he has outraged all truthfulness and candor.



How far religious bodies, in such cases, can be innocent, it might be well to inquire.

If really called to the ministry, it has been maintained, that a man can never silence his convictions, nor be satisfied in any other calling. Hence, it is hinted, that even guilt should not exclude him from the sacred office, as such exclusion must peril his peace for time, if not his salvation for eternity. Without pretending to say how much of truth there may be in the statement, for the present purpose, it is sufficient to reply, that he alone is responsible for the liability. No personal convenience, or interest, may be allowed to counterbalance the purity of the ministry, as the peace of the church. Wisdom suggests, that the convictions of better men are a safer guide.

Will any supplicate forbearance in behalf of *superior talents*? Of what avail are talents, if they cannot shield us from vice and crime! The more elevated the endowments, the more disgraceful and the more inexcusable the fall. Talent, however important, is of less consequence in the ministry, than character. Christ's cause can better do without the abilities, rare as they may be, possessed by this class of men, than to bear the reproach, which they are sure to inflict upon it.

The voice of history, did space permit, might profitably be heard upon this subject. Facts are fearful arguments against all manner of mistakes and mal-administrations, the evils of sin and error can never be fully understood, until they are seen in their consequences. Cases of the description now before us frequently excite sympathy, a generous nature easily gives place to the suggestions of mercy. But alas! after these tender feelings have been outraged again and again, and the faintest hope gives place to blank despair, we too often learn, but not soon enough to avert the evil, that misdirected clemency is little short of cruelty, that endeavors to screen the guilty frequently injure the innocent, and, that unavailing efforts to save a fallen brother wound and disgrace the cause of the Master.

From personal memory, at least a dozen instances of "restoration" after "suspension," or "deposition," for scandalous offences, might be given, the results of not a single one of which, would be mentioned by any fair minded person in favor of the practice of such restoration.

The range of illustration and proof, which has now been

presented, it would seem, ought to be sufficient. If the several lines of argument presented are legitimate, the general conclusion must be irresistible. Yet, there is another field, which must not be entirely neglected, though at the present stage of the discussion, it cannot be extensively traversed.

Neither the Church, nor the bodies which ecclesiastically represent it, can afford to have the confidence of the public lessened in the ministry as a profession. The hope of permanence and success depends, and must largely depend upon the maintenance of that confidence. And *purity* lies at the foundation of it. No intelligent people will be imposed upon by a polluted ministry. Even a church may subserve its selfish ends by *patronizing* a pastor of tainted character; but it will not trust him. Nor will the public sustain the bodies which lay their hands on unholy heads, and hold bad men in ecclesiastical fellowship. If it comes to be true and to be known, that the relations, which these bodies bear to the public, afford no protection against irregularity and impurity, they will cease to be respected, and their mission will be ended. It is not enough for a Synod to satisfy itself; it must satisfy the churches for which it acts, and the public whose confidence it invites, that those it commissions and holds in fellowship, are not only men of proper literary and theological attainments, but of such moral qualities as render them worthy of respect and confidence. And the conditions of continued membership most certainly must not be less elevated than the terms of admission. Ecclesiastical discipline must sustain ecclesiastical standards. It will not do to scrupulously guard the entrance, and utterly neglect the interior. It will not do to be rigid with applicants for "holy orders," and relinquish their accountability as soon as they are admitted. It will not do to carry the idea, that if men can successfully "steal the livery of heaven," they will be at full liberty to "serve the devil" in it as much as they please. The character of the profession, and the confidence which the public repose in it, depend much upon thoroughness of theological culture, but more upon the faithful enforcement of righteous ecclesiastical regulations.

And will the public mind be satisfied with any thing short of the full and final disfranchisement of all ministerial apostates? What has been the verdict in cases of

this kind? What was the decision of the people respecting Onderdonk, Moffat, Johnson and Pomeroy? Could any of those men have continued to perform the functions of the sacred office, upon a confession of guilt, and promise of reformation? Had such a decision been made by any ecclesiastical court respecting any of them, would the public have sanctioned it? Apostates of less note, of course, receive less attention. But the principle in all cases is the same, and should be applied with equal firmness, whether the position of the offender be prominent or obscure.

But, regardless of popular sentiment, with its *purity* the ministry must stand or fall. Can that purity be protected by measures less rigid, less extreme? Degrees of guilt are indicated by grades of punishment. Lessen the penal sanctions of the law, and crimes will be multiplied. Let the vicious escape odium, and vice will increase. Truth and purity cannot be maintained by an appeal to the sense of right, and the fear of God alone. Self-respect and relative respect, as well as safety, must be called in requisition. Many who are morally reckless, are kept within the bounds of decency, by the force of circumstances.

Law and public sentiment protect the virtues and restrain the vices of the people, not less by punishment and proscription, than as a means of education, establishing common standards and uniform habits of thought and action.

Religious communities are governed by the same general principles. Here, as elsewhere, as some minds are constituted, the hope of impunity is a sufficient motive to sin. Under the control of selfishness, and in the direction of gratification, the disposition is to go as far as we can, or dare venture. And here, as elsewhere, the enforcement of law is presumed to fix the limits of safety and interest. Hence, no association will be better than its laws. It is not to be expected, that the faith of the Church will be more truthful than its creed; that its morality will rise above its rules of discipline; that its spirituality will exceed the claims of its covenant. And this view is just as applicable to ecclesiastical bodies, as to the Church. The enforcement of law indicates the standard of morality. Connivance encourages the commission of sin. The example of the fallen must be used to prevent others from falling. Let apostates from the sacred office, be treated as

they should be. Such treatment will keep bad men out, and good men in. If the purity of the profession is to be protected, the same member must not be put in a condition to disgrace it a second time. *Any minister, who by crime or vice once dishonors the sacred office, should be forever excluded from it.*

This proposition has now been tested by the Scriptural view of forgiveness; by Scriptural examples, presumed to be in conflict with it; by the law of the Jewish Priesthood; by the teachings of Paul; by the indications of vice in a cultivated mind; by the bearings of past infamy upon present fidelity; by the influence upon the Church, of being committed to a pastor of sullied reputation; by the voice of history; by the demands of public sentiment; by the law which protects purity, and by some minor points which need not be repeated.

It is not always easy to "deal gently with the erring," and yet make the proper distinctions between the "clean and the unclean." "Right too rigid hardens into wrong," while law, held loosely, encourages crime. Doubt should favor innocence, and possible mistakes should incline to mercy. But sin in holy places must not be winked at, nor must the treasures of heavenly truth be entrusted to the hands of the weak, or the wicked.

---

## ARTICLE V.

### DANIEL AND HIS PROPHECIES.

By JOSEPH A. SEISS, D. D., Philadelphia.

#### I. THE HISTORY OF DANIEL.

Pains have been taken by certain classes of interpreters, German and English,\* to make believe, that we know almost nothing of Daniel, the author of the Book of Holy Scripture which bears his name. It has not been because

---

\* Lengerke, De Wette, Davidson, Williams, etc.

ample records are wanting on the subject. Gibbon once said, "the stubborn mind of an infidel is guarded by a secret, incurable suspicion." And it is this "incurable suspicion," this shutting up of the soul against the truth, by a haughty hyper-criticism, this forgone judgment against the supernatural and miraculous, in which we are to find the reason why some men discover no information about "Daniel the Prophet." The truth is, we know more of him, than we do of Adam, Noah or Job; as much, as of Joseph, Isaiah, or Herod the Great; and nearly as much as of Moses, David, or St. Paul.

Three Daniels are spoken of in the Scriptures: one, a son of David, born in Hebron, of Abigail the Carmelitess, referred to, in 1 Chron. 3 : 1; another, a son of Ithamar, who went up with Ezra, after the Babylonish captivity, and of whom we read in Ez. 8 : 2, and Neh. 10 : 6; and the third, the great Daniel, the prophet of God, who wrote one of the most remarkable and important books of the inspired canon.

This Daniel, with whom alone we have here to do, was descended from one of the highest Jewish families; in the last period of the Hebrew monarchy. He was almost certainly of royal blood, born at Jerusalem. He was among the captives, whom Nebuchadnezzar carried away from Judea to Babylon; at which time, he was a boy not over fourteen years of age. Of all the Jewish youths thus transported, he was the foremost in every quality and attainment of body and mind. He was without blemish, skilful in wisdom, cunning in knowledge, understanding science, and having ability in him; which, with his royal blood, soon secured for him an election for service in the king's palace.

For three years he was put under special training for court-duty, and given in charge of the Babylonian eunuchs for that purpose. It had been prophesied by Isaiah to Hezekiah: "Of thy sons which shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon," (Is. 39 : 7). The inference is, that in Daniel was this prediction fulfilled, and, that in suffering and privation, he was formed for the place in which he became so conspicuous and notable. His name, also, was changed, partly, as a badge of servitude, partly to obliterate the memory of his early home, but principally, that he might forget the

God of Israel, and become a servant of Nebuchadnezzar's god.

Still, though living among an idolatrous people, put into a school of idolaters, named after an idol god, and serving in the court of an idolatrous king, Daniel never became an idolater. From childhood he had been instructed in the knowledge and law of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, his fathers; and from those teachings he never departed. When but a boy of fourteen, he refused to be persuaded to eat of the king's meats, because they were connected with idol-sacrifices, and were not prepared in accord with Jehovah's law. And so vigorous was his youthful faith, heralding in its simplicity his future greatness, that he trusted in God to uphold his health and strength by pulse and water, quite as well as through the stronger but forbidden food. He was from the first persuaded, and on this persuasion he ever acted—an abiding model for all young men—that abstinence from sinful indulgences is the only sure way to real prosperity in the end. In that faith he succeeded beyond all his heathen companions when a youth. And in that faith he continued, and prospered, from the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, through all the changes of empire, and all the extraordinary trials of his high place, down to Cyrus. From early youth one of the judges of Babylon, president over all the colleges of its wise men, head of the heads of all the sections of the empire, amid all the intrigues, indigenous to Oriental despotisms; amid all the envy toward a foreign captive as a councillor of royalty; amid all the troubles incident to the king's seven years insanity, and the murder of two of his successors; amid all the varied changes of the kingdom and its monarchs; he maintained an unbroken political greatness of seventy years, preserved his integrity untarnished, and outlived envy, jealousy and dynasties. Honored during forty years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, entrusted with the king's business under the insolent and sensual Belshazzar, owned by the conquering Medo-Persians, the stay and earthly protector of his people during the dreary years of their exile, the writer most likely of the decree of Cyrus giving leave for their return to the land of their fathers, a worshipper of the true God, in the most dissolute and degraded, as the most grand of the old heathen cities, his life presents one of the rarest pictures the world has ever beheld—a living

poem of faith—a miracle of moral greatness and achievement.

Four times, outside of the Book of Daniel, is this distinguished man referred to. He is twice mentioned by Ezekiel; once for his pre-eminent godliness, and once for his transcendent wisdom. In the one instance, the word is: "Son of man, when the land sinneth against me by trespassing grievously, \* \* \* though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness," (Ezek. 14 : 13, 14). In the other instance, the prince to Tyre is charged with the presumption of professing to be "wiser than Daniel," (Ezek. 28 : 3). And the Saviour himself is twice said to have referred to him, in full acknowledgement of his eminent character, as a servant and prophet of God. (Matt. 24 : 15; Mark 13 : 14).

## II. THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

The Book of Daniel is quite as remarkable as the life of its author. "Daniel," says Jerome, "not only as do other prophets, writes that Christ should come, but also teaches at what time he should come, and arranges the kings in order, and numbers the years, and announces the most evident signs." But for this very reason it has been assailed, and the most extraordinary attempts made to impeach its prophetic character. The natural heart dislikes certainty and definiteness in sacred things. As long as they are left in the mist, capable of being turned and twisted into harmony with any system that may be invented, people are quite willing to have them pass for divine; but so soon as they become fixed, and fasten down upon definite events and dates, the character of which can no longer be doubted, then the proud heart rebels, its lurking unbelief is detected, and the superior clearness and certainty of the thing is made an argument for the rejection of it as not divine. This was the ground upon which Porphyry, in the third century, assailed the inspiration of this book; and the same is the staple of argument, on the part of troops of rationalistic critics in modern times.

But, we have no quarrel with the Book on this score, and consider it very unreasonable, that any one else should have. We accept and hold it, from beginning to end, as it stands in the Canon, with perhaps a most trifling exception, as the production of the great Daniel of the cap-



tivity; and by no possibility the work of any other man. We receive it, at the same time, as an inspired book, unerring in its history, and infallible in its predictions; yea, one of the noblest and most important individual sections of the Word of God.

It is agreed on all hands, that the Book of Daniel is from one writer. Its style, language, structure, and the interior dependence of one part on another, prove that it was composed by one mind, and proceeded from one author. And, as the production of one author, it is impossible, from the nature of the contents, the language employed, the perfect mastery of facts and their minutiae, and the exactness of allusions, which could not have been known by any one, in the time, to which some have assigned its composition, that it could have been written by any other than the very Daniel whose history it gives, and who so often, in the course of the narrative, claims to be the seer and actor, whose life and visions it records.

It cannot be successfully disputed, that this Book was received into the canon of the Old Testament, as the authentic and sacred work of the Daniel of the captivity, which canon was regarded as complete long before the time of the Maccabees,—the time to which skeptical critics would refer it. With all the scrupulousness of the Jews, as to what they admitted into the catalogue of their sacred books, there is no instance, in which they ever classed the book of Daniel with Apocryphal writings, or doubted concerning its authenticity, or inspiration.

Josephus witnesses, that this Book of Daniel was in existence in the time of Alexander the Great; that it was shown to that conqueror in Jerusalem by the high priest, as one of the prophetic books of the Jews; that it told that a Greek should destroy the Persian Empire; and that Alexander was encouraged by it to undertake his Eastern expeditions, and was so pleased to learn what he had ascertained from it, that he agreed to grant to the Jews whatever favors they might desire of him. *Antiquities*, Tom. XI. chap. VIII. This account is corroborated by other historic facts, viz.: that Alexander was at that time personally in Palestine, that he had an interview with the high priest and others, that the Jews voluntarily surrendered to him, and, that he did treat them favorably. Yet all this occurred more than a century and a half before the time of the Maccabees.

But, above and beyond all this, is the testimony of the Lord Jesus himself. In Matt. 24 : 15, he says : "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation *spoken of by Daniel, the Prophet*, stand in the holy place (whoso readeth let him understand), then," &c. In Mark 13 : 4, the same is again recorded : "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation, *spoken of by Daniel the prophet*, standing where it ought not (let him that readeth understand,)" &c. The Saviour here recognizes Daniel as a true and real historic personage, the same as Moses, Isaiah or David ; He distinctly ascribes to him the character of an inspired and worthy prophet of God ; He also refers to him as the author of a book, quotes from it as well known, and commands and admonishes, that special attention be given to what is thus prophetically contained in that Book. The world knows of no other "Daniel the Prophet," and of no other Book of Daniel the Prophet, to whose records to give special heed, or which speaks of such an abomination as that, to which the Saviour refers. But we do know, that this very Book of Daniel was in existence in the Saviour's time, that it was then received and held by all as one of the sacred books, and that it does speak of the very thing, to which the Saviour refers. He must, therefore, have had this Daniel, and this Book, in his eye.

Either then, this Book of Daniel is an authentic and inspired production of the man, of whom it speaks, or the Saviour was misled and mistaken. And if the Saviour was in error, he was not God, nor a reliable prophet of God ; and the whole system of Christianity must go by the board as a delusion and a cheat ! The whole religion of the Bible, thus stands or falls with this Book of Daniel. Deny its authenticity and prophetic character, and you strip Christ of all claims to our confidence, and leave no ground for faith at all. And when the matter comes to such a pass, it is time for a criticism, which would fain call itself Christian, to hide its face, and confess, that it has sinned before God and man, in attempting to make believe, that this great and holy Book is a forgery, and unworthy of our regard.

Nor will it answer to bring in half way proposals, to the effect that it were written by some other Daniel, and that its object and tendency was good, though feigned and overstated. Either it is divine and true throughout, or it is an insufferable imposture, and an immoral and untrust-

worthy thing throughout. If another Daniel wrote it, he was a consummate liar, upon a most frightful scale, and in a line of particular aggravation. Even the heathen had better ideas of morality than to allow such forgeries in the name of God; as lawful means of edifying his people. And then, to make the Saviour himself connive at, and sanction, such a cheat, is irremediably fatal to his claims as the Son of God, and to Christianity as the religion of God.

The original Book of Daniel is written in two distinct languages. The first chapter, and the first three verses of the second, is written in Hebrew. From chapter second, verse fourth, to the end of the seventh chapter, it is written in Chaldee. The eighth chapter takes up the Hebrew again, which is continued on to the end.

We have seen it stated, that "it is now utterly impossible to ascertain the reasons why one portion of this Book was written in Chaldee, and another in Hebrew." But this is a misstatement. The reason for the use of the two languages is plainly inferable from the nature of the subjects. Where the language is different, the central subject is different. The early history of Daniel and his companions, is a part of the history of God's people, and so it is written in their national language. It is Hebrew. The account touching Nebuchadnezzar's forgotten dream, its interpretation, and the historical matters following; had reference to the world-power, and the affairs of the empire. It relates to God's dispensations to the heathen, as also Daniel's first vision, which supplements the revelation in the king's dream, expands it, and fills it up. These, therefore, are given in the world's language, which was chiefly employed by the Babylonians, and then understood from the Persian Gulf to Damascus. What comes after the seventh chapter relates also in part to the world-powers, but only as they stand connected with the people of God, the coming of the Christ, and the setting up of his glorious kingdom. The centre is different from the other instances. Hence, the common language of the Prophets is resumed, and what mainly concerns God's people is written in their own language.

There is thus a distinct and ascertainable principle, at once beautiful and just, upon which these different languages are employed. What relates specially to the world

and its empires, is given in the language of the then great head of those empires; and what relates specially to the Divine kingdom and its adherents, trials and triumphs, is given in the sacred language of the chosen people. Thus even in its remote external accidents the Book of Daniel suggests the broad and everlasting difference which exists to the eye and mind of God between his own people, and the common world with which they are in contact. The whole thing argues one author to the Book, and that author not only versed in knowledge and languages as only the Daniel of the captivity was, but also in profoundest internal accord with the spirit of prophecy and the mind of God.

### III. THE DANIELIAN THEOLOGY.

The Theology of the Book of Daniel, has also been brought forward as an argument against its genuineness and inspiration. It is hardly worth while to notice such criticism. Within a year or two past, there was found a short poem on a blank leaf of an early copy of the works of John Milton, in the British Museum. It was apparently signed J. M. It was published, as perhaps the production of Milton, and a thousand critics set to work to decide the question. Learned men and adepts pronounced it a genuine Miltonic composition, and that Milton only could have woven "the subtle melody" of its lines. Others, equally wise and experienced, declared it mere rubbish, and that Milton never could have written it, except "in his dotage." And so the controversy goes on, with no prospect that criticism will ever settle whether Milton wrote it or not. How great, therefore, is the presumption and conceit of a certain school of philologists, critics and literary experts, who claim to be able to tell, by internal evidence alone, just what chapters and verses of each particular writer of the Scriptures are from him, and what not! They blate largely about what is Petrine, Pauline, Jehovistic, Elohistie, Maccabean, &c. Wearily picking up out of grammars and vocabularies the dried bits of a dead language, not a word of which they can pronounce as the people who spoke it, they fancy they can feel and detect all variations or idea pertaining or not to each author, and, hence, take upon themselves authoritatively to expurgate the sacred Scriptures, and to cast out this and the other book, or passage from the canon, telling us, that such and

such things are apocryphal, and on no other ground, than that *so their critical sense decides*. And yet here is a poem, in English, the plain English we all speak, English which a child can read and master,—a poem written in London, in the time of Milton,—which Englishmen, fellow-countrymen of Milton, his fellow-townsmen, familiar with every line he ever wrote, critics, experts, poets themselves, cannot tell, if it be John Milton's or not! Out upon such pretensions and attempts to mutilate our Bibles! If the best English critics in the world cannot settle, from internal evidence, whether a poem, in the tongue which they have known from their cradles, is Milton's or not, it is worse than ridiculous for men to presume, upon no better evidence, to decide that the Book of Daniel is not Daniel's work.

But the Book of Daniel does contain a Theology, one which it is the duty of believers to study, one which is particularly rich and clear, and one which it may be very proper to glance at in this connection.

1. *Of God.* The existence of one God, supreme over all things, is clearly taught in this Book. Daniel said to the king, "there is a God in heaven;" 2 : 28. The king is also made to confess, "there is no other God that can deliver after this sort;" 3 : 29. The same is pronounced "the most High," 7 : 25; also, "the great and dreadful God," 9 : 4; "yea, the God of gods," 11 : 36.

Neither is it some fancied being, that is thus spoken of, different from that one God, who revealed himself to Abraham, Moses, and the prophets of Israel. Daniel worshipped this same God as the God of his Jewish fathers; 2 : 23. The God of the Book of Daniel, is none other than the living and true God, beside whom there is no God.

The God of the Book of Daniel is described as possessed of all the proper attributes of God. He is "God of heaven;" 2 : 8, 37, 44. "Wisdom and might are His;" 2 : 20. "He knoweth what is in darkness, and light dwelleth with him;" 2 : 22. He "liveth forever;" 4 : 34; 6 : 20, 26. "He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" 4 : 35; He is "King of heaven," "God of gods, and Lord of kings;" 4 : 37; 2 : 47; 11 : 36. He is "able to deliver his servants;" 3 : 17, 29. He is the God, in whose hand man's breath and all man's ways are; 5 : 23. "All his works

are truth, and his ways judgment;" 4 : 37. He is righteous, 9 : 7, 14, 16; "merciful and gracious," 9 : 9; hears prayer, 9 : 17, 23; 10 : 12; is angry with sin, 9 : 16; and is able to abase them that walk in pride, 4 : 37.

The God of the Book of Daniel, exercises a particular providence over all the affairs of the world, and all events are ascribed to him. Nebuchadnezzar was made to confess, that "the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will;" that "He changeth the times and the seasons; He removeth kings and setteth up kings; He giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding;" and, that His "dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom from generation to generation;" 2 : 21; 4 : 32, 34; 6 : 27. The fancied god of Deism and Rationalistic philosophy, who is forever bound by his own laws, and never interferes in any way with their natural operation, is not the God of the Book of Daniel, as he is not the god of any portion of the Bible. Daniel's God is present with all His works, concerned in all that cometh to pass, and ever giving great signs and mighty wonders. He gave Jehoiakim king of Judea into Nebuchadnezzar's hand; 1 : 2. He brought Daniel into favor; 1 : 9. He gave the four Hebrew youths knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom; 1 : 17; 2 : 23. He gave Nebuchadnezzar his kingdom, power and glory; 2 : 37; 5 : 18. He sets up and gives out dominion, and creates the kingdom, that is to destroy all other kingdoms, and to stand forever; 2 : 44. He made known to the king, what was to be in the future; 2 : 45. He delivered the Hebrew youths from the fiery furnace; 3 : 29. He decreed the king's humiliation and insanity; 4 : 24. He numbered and finished the kingdom of Belshazzar; 5 : 26. He delivered Daniel from the lions; 6 : 20—22. He giveth judgment to the saints; 8 : 22. He brought forth his people out of the land of Egypt, scattered them for their sins, and heard when the voice of confession and supplication came up before him; 9 : 3—23. And He comforteth his anxious ones; 12 : 19.

In all this, there certainly is nothing discernible, which does not fully accord with both the earlier and later Scriptures, or which we will not do well to accept, believe, and act on, as immutable and most precious truth. The Book of Daniel gives glorious testimony to our all-glorious God.

2. *Of Angels.* It is agreeable to reason and Scripture to believe, that the wide interval between us and God is not a blank, but is filled up with orders of creatures superior to man, who are also largely concerned in the administrations of the Divine government. The existence of such orders is certainly taught in the Book of Daniel, and a very important part is assigned them in the affairs of our world. This has also been objected to this Book, and the system of Angelology which it presents, is said to be a mere transfer from heathen theosophy, and, hence, not entitled to be taken as divine and true.

Nebuchadnezzar, in relating his vision, does indeed, refer to *holy watchers*, after the style of the ancient Zoroastrian religionists, who recognized secondary deities under this name. According to the Zend-Avesta "Ormuzd has set four *watchers* in the four quarters of the heavens, to keep their eye upon the host of the stars. One stands here as the *watcher* of his circle; the other, there. He has placed them at such and such posts, as *watchers* over such and such a circle of the heavenly regions; and this by his own power and might." Such was the religion taught this heathen king. He knew nothing of the true Bible doctrine, or the subject of angels. And, when he had a vision from God, and beheld in it the movements of angels of God, how was it possible for him to describe them, except in the language and conceptions of his own polytheistic system? He called them by the name of the Zoroastrian sub-deities, because he knew no other name, and knew of no such heavenly beings except as his theosophy fancied. Daniel does not say, that these angels were the Zoroastrian watchers. He whom the king described as a Zoroastrian *watcher*, the prophet plainly identifies, not as a heathen sub-deity, but as a messenger of the true God of heaven and earth; and the decree which the watchers uttered, he interprets as "the decree of the most High," given into the hands of angels to execute. There is nothing Magian, or at all different from the common Scriptural teaching, or the subject either before and since Daniel's time.

Daniel uses various designations for these heavenly agents. He calls them "*angels*," 6 : 21; *ministering ones*, 7 : 10; *holy ones*, 8 : 13, 14; *chief princes*, and *princes*, 10 : 13, 20; 12 : 1. He also gives the proper names of some of them, Gabriel, 9 : 21; Michael, 10 : 13; 12 : 1.



He describes the aspects of the angels as prevaillingly human, but very exalted and glorious, 5 : 24; 8 : 16, 26; 10 : 5, 6, 17; 12 : 7. One in particular, he represents as a man, clothed in linen, girded with fine gold of Uphaz, whose body was like the beryl, his face as the appearance of lightning, his eyes as lamps of fire, his arms and feet resembling polished brass, and his voice like the voice of a multitude; 10 : 5, 6.

He also represents these celestial beings as exceedingly numerous. In his vision of the Ancient of days, he beheld "thousand thousands ministering unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand, standing before Him;" 7 : 9, 10.

The office he assigns to angels, is the office of creatures only, and that of ministering organs of the Divine providence and government. They conveyed a knowledge of God's purposes to Nebuchadnezzar; 4 : 13—17, 24. One of them was sent to hinder the lions from harming the wronged prophet; 6 : 22. One of them acted as God's messenger to interpret to Daniel his vision of the four beasts; 7 : 16. Gabriel performed a like office with reference to the vision of the ram and goat, 8 : 16—26; and the seventy weeks, 9 : 21—27. And still another acted as his hierophant in all the remaining visions. Others of them are represented as serving as heavenly guardians of God's people, and their helpers and princes; particularly Michael, the great prince, and one of the chief princes, who standeth for the children of the prophets' people; 10 : 13; 12 : 1.

Daniel says nothing very special about *bad* angels. And yet, it would seem as if some of these mysterious principalities and powers were to be considered as evil, and antagonistic to God and his gracious purposes. We read of "the prince of the kingdom of Persia," 10 : 13; and "the prince of Grecia," 10 : 20; both of whom belong to these angelic potencies, and both of whom are represented as seeking to hinder the good angel, who was in converse with Daniel, and really so antagonistic, as to call forth violence to keep down their resistance; 10 : 20.

But, whether only good, or only some good and others evil, they are of various ranks and degrees of dignity. This particularly is objected against Daniel, as the mere fancy of Oriental Magianism. But such it is not. Distinctions among the heavenly hosts were revealed from the

first; and it would be out of harmony with all we know of God's creations, if such distinctions did not exist. We read of cherubim at the gates of Paradise, and specifically of "the angel of the Lord"—of morning stars singing together, and of Sons of God shouting for joy when the world was made—of seraphim and cherubim, crying the triune *Sanctus* before God—of chariots and horsemen, that make up the army of God, and the Captain of the Lord's hosts,—and all, long before the days of Daniel. That he should speak of these heavenly beings, therefore, as of different orders and degrees of rank, is in perfect harmony with what was revealed and recorded in the books of God before he wrote. And, that he should bring out the subject with greater conspicuity, is in perfect keeping with that progress of doctrine, so manifest in the whole method of revelation. If later prophets are to be considered as adding nothing to what was given by preceding ones, there was no real occasion for them, and we may as well burn all the sacred books after the Penteteuch. In harmony with the Scriptures in general, and only with greater clearness, does Daniel thus show us the differences of order among these heavenly intelligences, and their potency in human history, and the life of nations and nature. Compare also Col. 1 : 16 ; 1 Thess. 4 : 16 ; John 5 : 4 ; Heb. 1 : 7 ; Rev. 7 : 1—3 ; 14 : 8 ; 16 : 5 ; &c.

3. *Of The Christ.* "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." If prophets have in them nothing referring to the Christ, or leading the way to Him, we may safely assume, that they are none of God's prophets. But Daniel shows no deficiency in this particular. Nay, he has only too much, and that too definite and particular, to say about the Christ, to suit our rationalistic theologasters. Having not much occasion for a Saviour in their systems of thinking, of course, a book which makes so much of Him is quite at variance with their instincts of the truth, and hence, they would set it aside as apocryphal.

From the earliest ages, and among the chosen people throughout their history, the coming of One who should be the Deliverer and Saviour of all his, was not only hoped for, but this hope was the great centre of all their prophecies and all their ceremonies. That coming One was known by a variety of names; but by none more common than *Messiah*, an *anointed One*—*God's anointed*: Ps. 2 : 2. Daniel speaks of this coming One, and calls

Him absolutely and distinctively *Messiah*; 9 : 25, 26. He calls Him "*Messiah-Nagid*"—*Messiah the Prince*—the supreme Ruler—the One that goes in and out before the people in the administration of government. In the same manner is *Messiah* described in the earlier Scriptures; Is. 9 : 7; 55 : 4; Micah 5 : 1; Ezek. 34 : 23.

The office, or work of the *Messiah*, is also distinctly described. He was to "finish the transgression;" that is, to restrain it, shut it up from overflowing, stop it;—to "make an end of sin;" seal it up, cover it;—to "make reconciliation for iniquity;" appease wrath with reference to it, give satisfaction for it, restore the peace which it had broken;—to "bring in everlasting righteousness;" produce a just basis for the justification of sinners, and for the deliverance of them from condemnation;—to "seal vision and prophecy;" that is, consummate, establish, fulfill and complete them, settling them as true, and bringing to their end the things foreshown in them. 8 : 24.

His qualification for all this, and the manner of accomplishing it, are also given. He is referred to, as capable of suffering, 9 : 26; and yet is described as "*The Most Holy*," 9 : 24. He was to endure a death penalty—"be cut off." The word *carath* constantly denotes a penal excision—a cutting off for sin—a violent death for offence against the law. Thus was the *Messiah* to be "cut off," as also expressed by Isaiah 53. But he was to be cut off "*not for himself*." His was to be a *vicarious* suffering—the endurance of penal inflictions for the sake, and in the place, of others, 9 : 26.

But other works and grander administrations than these are ascribed to him. There is princely rulership and heavenly dominion assigned to Him, as well as earthly humiliation. He comes in the clouds of heaven, and dominion, glory and a kingdom are given Him, that all peoples should serve Him, all nations obey Him, and His kingdom never end, 7 : 13, 14, 27.

This King is described as of human birth, "*the Son of man*," 7 : 13. The word *bar*, denotes descent; and *bar-anash*, descent from man. And yet he is further described, as much more than man, and truly Divine. He is accompanied by angels to the throne of God, in that Majesty which had, before Daniel in this place, been spoken of God only, "*coming with the clouds of heaven*," 7 : 13. As God manifested Himself in the cloud in the Exodus, the

wilderness, the tabernacle, the temple, and as the clouds hide from us all that is beyond them, so they are spoken of continually as the visible hiding-place of the invisible Presence of God. To ascribe to any being a place there, was to associate him with the prerogative of God, who maketh the cloud His chariot, about whom are clouds and darkness, whose pavilion round about Him are thick clouds of the sky, who rideth upon the swift cloud, and the clouds are the dust of His feet. Compare 3 : 25. Even the rationalistic and skeptical critics agree, that in the Book of Daniel "the Messiah appears as a superhuman being," and has "qualities and attributes of Jehovah transferred to him."

Neither is this a mere imitation of Ezeiel, taken from the Sibylline books in the time of the Maccabees, as these men would teach us. It is the common doctrine of the preceding Scriptures. Jesus himself cited the 110th Psalm in proof of his Divinity, Matt. 22 : 41—45. He there appears as David's Lord, sitting at the right hand of God, a King whose power none could withstand; and as God, and the Son of God, whose throne is forever; Heb. 1 : 8. Isaiah had declared concerning that son which was to be born into the world, and whose administration was to be so glorious, that his name should be called, and so Himself also be, "Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace;" Is. 9 : 6. He had also been announced as to be born of a Virgin, and that His name should be Immanuel, God with us; Is. 7 : 14. Micah, the contemporary of Isaiah, had prophesied His birth at Bethlehem to be the Ruler of Israel, with the going forth from the old, from the days of eternity; 5 : 1. Zechariah speaks of Him as God's Fellow, 13 : 7; and Malachi as the Lord whom Israel sought, 3 : 1; all answering to the Saviour's own account of himself, that he was before Abraham, that he came forth from the Father, that he is one with the Father, and that whosoever saw him, saw the Father, of whom he is the only begotten Son.

As to the two-fold coming of Christ, like all the ancient Scriptures, the Book of Daniel does not clearly distinguish between them. There is a coming as the Son of man, ending in violent death, which referred to the advent in the flesh; and there is also a coming in the clouds of hea-

ven, as a triumphing Judge, and an everlasting and worshipful Ruler, 7 : 13, 16. But, exactly what relation the one had to the other, remained to be developed long afterwards. To reconcile these two pictures, quite comprehensible now, the ancient Rabbins conceived of two Messiahs, or a change in the manner of Christ's coming, according as they might prove themselves worthy or unworthy.

Of all the prophets, Daniel is the only one, by whom was revealed the definite time of the Saviour's Advent; 9 : 24—26.

4. *Of the State of Man and the Securement of Divine Favor.* It has been objected to the Book of Daniel, that its tone is ascetic and Pharisaic, after the style of the later Jews. This is about equal to all the rest of this class of objections, without foundation.

A general and dreadful corruption of humanity is certainly implied. Profoundly penitential is the confession which Daniel makes of the sins of his people, not excepting himself; even though they are contemplated as the best of the race, and of all men the most favored of God, 9 : 4—19. And in answer to this confession and prayer, Gabriel announces the Messiah, as the One through whom atonement should be made, transgression restrained, sins stayed, righteousness brought in, and the sin penalty taken away, 9 : 21—26. Is this un-evangelical? Is it not in thorough accord with prophets and apostles?

Great power is assigned to self-humiliation and prayer, 2 : 18, 19; 6 : 11; 9 : 3; 10 : 2; but to say, that this is superstitiously exaggerated, is to fly into the face of the Scriptures, and the recorded experiences of the saints in all ages, before and since. The truth is, that there is nothing like humble and earnest prayer. It puts all the resources of Omnipotence at the command of man; provided only, that he asks no unreasonable, unnecessary, or wrong thing. Jesus himself says: "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, He will give it you." John 55 : 7; 16 : 23. And prayer, such as Daniel's, belonged to the exercise of living faith, which is the hand that takes hold upon God's salvation, according to all the Scriptures.

That he should advise Nebuchadnezzar to escape from his sins by righteousness, from his iniquities by showing mercy to the poor, 4 : 27, was simply the common doc-

trine of repentance, which requires the breaking off of sin by its opposite, a thing forever requisite to forgiveness. It was the same that Jonah preached to the Ninevites, which the Saviour himself accepted in Zaccheus, and which ever goes along with the proclamation of the Gospel. It was just that lesson which John, the Baptizer, urged upon Herod, Paul upon Felix, and that any preacher of righteousness would lay down to a proud, unjust and oppressive heathen despot. And it is written in the New Testament as well as the Old, that the merciful shall obtain mercy; whether unto everlasting life or not, is another question, upon which Daniel's advice does not touch.

That he should resort to fasting, and abstinence from pleasant food, on two great public occasions—the approaching close of the years of captivity, and the hindrances interposed to the rebuilding of the temple by the councillors of Cyrus,—was just what God had commanded through Joel to be done in times of trouble, and what had been acceptably done by many before him. Even the Saviour himself has given directions for like occasions, and has told us, that there are some evils which cannot be dislodged without it. And that Christian is deficient in some of the most vital impulses of true godliness, who cannot see and feel the propriety, at times at least, of just such abnegations in connection with special applications for the help of God.

The Book of Daniel contemplates the mercy and favor of God as belonging to those who persistently and faithfully abjure all idolatry from the worship of the true God only. This is the great lesson of the account of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego; 3 : 13—28. True piety is located in love to God, the keeping of His commandments, and earnest seeking unto Him with penitence, prayer and faith; 9 : 3, 4. God's people are such that depart not from His precepts and judgments, 9 : 5; but hearken unto His servants the prophets, 9 : 6; obey the voice of the Lord, and walk in his ways, 9 : 10; turn from iniquities, and understand the truth, 9 : 13. And to all such the mercies and forgiveness of God, and all the promises of His covenant, are made to apply, 9 : 4, 9; 10 : 12. Surely, this is neither Pharisæic nor unevangelical. It is God's own truth.

5. *Of the Consummation.* The Book of Daniel says nothing about heaven, as a place of abode for the righteous.

The whole blessedness of man, in its highest consummation, is connected with the setting up of a kingdom, which the God of heaven is to set up, which shall break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms, and shall stand for ever, 2 : 44. It is a kingdom which is finally to supersede and take the place of the present world powers, 2 : 44. It is established by the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven, 7 : 13, 14. It is not fully manifested till after the judgment shall sit, 7 : 26, 27. It is a kingdom over the earth, under the heaven, 7 : 27. Men and nations as they dwell upon the earth are to be the subjects of it, 7 : 14. The Son of man is to be the personal possessor of this kingdom, and all its glory, dominion and authority, 7 : 13, 14, 27. The saints are to have a share in this kingdom, and in the administration of its affairs, 7 : 18, 27. It is to be eternal, 2 : 44; 7 : 14, 18. The Prince of this kingdom was to come as a sufferer at the end of sixty-nine hebdomads from the decree of the authorities at Babylon to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, 9 : 25, 26. Great calamities and destructions were to befall Jerusalem and its people subsequent to this restoration, before the predicted kingdom should be manifested in its full glory, 9 : 26, 27; 11 : 21—45; 12 : 1. The saints of God are to be oppressed and sufferers in this world, until the judgment shall sit, 7 : 19—27. Those of the Lord's people who die meanwhile, are in a state of hopeful rest, 12 : 13. There will be two resurrections of the dead, one to everlasting life, and one to shame and everlasting contempt, 12 : 2. The righteous and the faithful are to have a most exalted lot in the time of their resurrection, 12 : 3, 13. The end of all God's present administrations with men, and the consummation of all His gracious purposes, will have been accomplished with the final setting up of this glorious kingdom of the Son of man and His saints, 7 : 28; 8 : 19; 9 : 24; 12 : 4, 6—13.

There are other points of even greater interest, but we cannot pursue them, at present. If any one is attracted to a closer study of this noble prophet and his noble book from what we have written, these notes will not have been presented in vain.



ARTICLE VI.

THE RELATION OF THE TEXT TO THE SERMON. BY DR. KAHLE, PASTOR AT CAYMEN. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN.

By Rev. J. D. SEVERINGHAUS, A. M., Richmond, Ind.

Some years ago Pastor Sulze of Osnabrück, was called to the Jacobi church in Chemnitz, by the City Council of that place. And, since in Saxony, it is required of every preacher, at his induction into office, that he attest his allegiance to the Confessions by an oath, with reference to which Sulze had conscientious scruples, he entered into an inquiry with the Church government of Saxony, and the result was, that he declined the call to Chemnitz, and published a document entitled: "The Bible and the Confessions," in which he tried to show, that the Confessions of the Reformation period were not binding upon us in their *form*, but only in their life-germ, Christ. In one section of this book (§ 14, p. 80), the author gives his view of the relation which the Holy Scriptures sustain to the Sermon, and he asserts, that the weakness and inefficiency of most sermons is owing to the fact, more especially, that the present preaching upon biblical lessons does not afford a full enjoyment of the Scriptures, nor lead to any free and immediate edification. To explain the Scriptures is a different thing from preaching. Sulze advises: "Let a preacher make, according to the established rules, simple comments, in a running order, which shall familiarize the congregation with the Scriptures. Let him interrupt this order only then, when his heart prompts him to say something in an immediate way to the congregation; only then let him preach a regular sermon, and that without a text." Although this good counsel borders on the comical, and reminds one of the proposition which Bengel (*Life of Burk*, 2 ed. p. 579) has recorded in his traveling diary as a curiosity: "One should not preach too often and especially at not stated periods, but rather have the church bell rung, when in a mood for preaching," yet the Editor of a

new homiletical periodical, published by Wigand in Leipzig, and entitled, "The Preaching of our Times," has joined himself to Sulze's notion, and appealed to Cl. Harms, who, "as is well known, frequently preached without any Bible text at all."

To this it may be replied in the first place, that Cl. Harms, "as is well known," did not do this "frequently," but only a few times, and in his "Pastoral Theology," (I. 83) he says explicitly: "He would allow this practice only in exceptional cases, in addition to other reasons, also for this one belonging to pastoral theology: the congregation loses its safeguard, or that which is at least regarded as such, that such a sermon is really the Word of God." But if the long list of contributors to "The Sermon of the Present," should appear imposing to any one, we might appeal from them for the necessity of Bible texts to the Sermon, to the *Consensus gentium*, and not only to the *Consensus* of all homiletical authorities, not even Vinet excepted.

When in the year 1851, Ad. Riff, in the "Contributions to Theological Science," (published by Reuss & Cunitz, 2 parts, Jena,) attacked the use of Bible texts more severely than was done by Sulze, he was scarcely thought of, and still less deemed worthy of a reply. Even preachers, who otherwise conform themselves pedantically to the revised Liturgy of 1829, depart from it in that particular, that they do not venture to separate the sermon from the text, to the extent therein recommended, (p. 5) according to which either the Gospel or the Epistle may, when read, be designated as the text for the sermon following, and the pericope thus read is not to be announced again from the pulpit. N. B. After the second pericope, the creed, the *sanctus*, the general church prayer, the Lord's prayer and the principal hymn have come in between, if possible. If any one could allow himself to read the text from the altar, or even, as is often the case in cities, to have it read by the deacon, and then a half hour later, to preach the sermon on it, that, indeed, would be preaching without a text. We, at least, call the sermons of Chrysostomus, and of other pulpit orators of the ancient Greek church, textless, although they are, without doubt, made with reference to the Scriptural lesson read in the liturgical part of the service, (the *ἀναγνώσματα*). But the *sensus communis* of our day protests against a Sermon, which would con-

vey the impression: "He speaketh of his own," and it is interesting to see how men of the most diverse tendency defend the use of a regular text from the Bible. I shall content myself with placing together the opinion of two men, who are looked upon by most of us with special reverence, namely: Rosenkranz and Nitzsch. Rosenkranz (*Theol. Encykl.* 2nd ed. p. 366,) draws the lines, inside of which the Sermon can have free play, as wide as possible. "The matter of the Sermon," he says, "is in the abstract the whole faith, in the concrete the whole life. Nothing human, nothing divine, is in itself excluded from it. It may rise to the greatest height, and descend into the deepest depth. The eternal being of God, the wonders of nature, the changes of history, the metamorphoses of mind, the ideal of the Redeemer, the struggle of asceticism, the crises of time—all offers itself as suitable for the contents of the sermon." "But," he continues (p. 367), "although it is entirely possible to make a Christian Sermon without any direct connection with the Bible text, nevertheless, the practice of taking a text is to be retained, so as to guard against branching off into heterogenous speaking." And Nitzsch (*Pract. Theol.* II, § 123), gives four reasons why the Sermon should not be without a text: (1.) The Word is to be made known in its character of a message; (2.) The Church wants a guaranty that divine truths, pertaining to the kingdom of God and the congregation, shall be preached; (3.) The biblical appearance of the truth maintains the order of a life-union between the dogmatical and the ethical element, and (4.) The sermon has always been textual in the Christian Church. I may be allowed to add a fifth reason, which, however, does not apply to such thinkers as Nitzsch and Rosenkranz; it is this: the poverty of thought with many preachers is supplemented by the richness of the Bible text, or differently stated: I would not regard myself as knowing anything for my congregation, without my Bible text alone. According to Nitzsch the text is so essential to the Sermon, that he has embraced it in his definition of the Sermon. "The Sermon," he says, (*Ibid.* § 101), "is an annunciation of the Word of God, as represented in the Holy Bible text, which is made with living reference to present circumstances and through called witnesses." And, indeed, if we would define the sermon, as it now is, and not as it has been in its historic beginnings, or in its transition periods, we are compelled to say:

a sermon without a text is no sermon at all. That short definition which Schnur of Mühlhausen gave in the *Ev. Gemeindeblatt* (1855, p. 198): "The sermon is an address made in the name of Christ, to His congregation and to His glory," is too general, however learnedly it was defended, even with an appeal to Homer's heralds. The Christian *ἄνθρωπος* differs from the Homeric in this, more especially, that whilst the learned are not agreed what the *ἄνθρωπος* of Homeric times really had to do and to announce, the trumpet of the Christian preacher gives no uncertain sound: "Thus it is written, that Christ must suffer and rise again on the third day from the dead, and that repentance and forgiveness of sin be preached in His name."

The preaching of the Apostles, was indeed, generally without a text. They did not always do as Philip, the Evangelist, who (Acts 8 : 35) opened his mouth and began at the same Scripture which the Ethiopian eunuch just read (Is. 53,) and preached unto him the Gospel of Jesus. They did not always take their matter from the evangelical history, which Christ had ordered to be preached in its manifest parts, for He had ordered, that where in the whole world the Gospel of His death was preached, there Mary, who had anointed him in Bethany, should be honorably remembered. If Peter commences his sermon in Cesarea, (Acts 10 : 37). "That word ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth, with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil," we may conclude, that the Apostles made known, above all things, the acts of mercy and the miraculous healings of Jesus, and especially the Gospel story, before hearers who were not acquainted with these things, and that based upon their apostolic teachings. Of the resurrection of Christ, the Acts of the Apostles, and 1 Cor. 15, bear sufficient testimony. But, there also, are sermons of Paul, in which not a single quotation from the O. T. occurs, no entering into the details of evangelical history, not even a direct reference to any expression of Christ, for example, the Epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians, the first to the Thessalonians. It has already been remarked, that the Sermon of the ancient Greek Church, in so far, as it is not a Homily, has generally no Bible text. The Sermon of Ambrosius, preparatory to

the Christmas festival, which Nesselmann cites, is also without a text. The same authority (p. XLVII.) cites a sermon from the middle ages of Peter Damiani (died 1072), as translated by Augusti, which, without any text, gives first the praise of John, thereupon his comparison with Peter, then his pre-eminence above all the disciples, and, finally, his benefit to us. It is more generally known, that the preaching monks preached often without a text. Berthold developes, in a sermon without a text, seven principal virtues from the seven planets, and the seven days of the week. Geiler, of Kaisersberg, has no text to any one of the forty-two sermons, that constitute his "Paradise for Souls." Catechetical sermons, are even now, quite frequently made without a text from the Bible. And, that among the many sermons, to which a text is prefixed only as a motto, there are not only bad ones, but also very good ones, which, therefore, seem to defend the neglect of taking a text for the sermon, there is no doubt. But all these exceptions only establish the rule. And, indeed, there are three exceptional cases, in which historically, and from inherent considerations, preaching without a text can be defended.

1. The missionary sermon, which is constantly tending to run into the catechetical. I should regard him a poor missionary, who would know no other way of preaching to the heathen, than with the Bible in hand, and by expounding single texts, instead of, like the Saviour, taking the matter of his sermon from the well, and the bread, or like Paul, from the altar to the unknown God, and from the question of the trembling jailer; but in the one, as well as the other, can preach with demonstration of the Spirit and power of Christ as our righteousness and strength.

2. The festival and occasional sermon, which, as such, is more of a casual address, than a sermon, for certainly Ebrard, (Ibid. § 189,) goes too far, when he says of the casual address: "It must start from a text, if it would merit the name of being an act of divine service." The fact, upon which the festival is founded, and the occasions requiring the casual address, are sometimes enough of a text. If ever, then it is upon the great festivals, that the Holy Ghost, through the preacher, and not he of himself, must preach the Gospel. The festival sermon must, as Harms

expresses it, be a priestly sermon and not a preacher sermon. Whoever has the Holy Ghost, his oil cruse will have no lack; he draws out of the fulness; the anointing teaches him all things, he needs not that any one instruct him. The single text soon becomes a restraint to the festival orator. And for the occasional sermon only, that text would be suitable, that is covered by the occasion, or the circumstances and scope, that naturally surround the speaker; it is more unbecoming to the pulpit to hang a *quasi* text on to the sermon, than to make a sermon full of the spirit of Jesus Christ without any text; but to find a third something in this dilemma, is not always possible. Think of the sermon of Strauss of the year 1831 to recommend the Liturgy: "Every Sunday an Easterday," which is demonstrated (a.) from its inherent signification, (b.) from the religious celebration of it. It is a master sermon that outlived several editions; but the text prefixed to it: "Sing unto the Lord, praise His name, make known his salvation from one day to another"—is no text at all, and it related to the sermon not much better than when preachers of the seventeenth century preceded their regular sermon on the pericope, by another one on some arbitrary text. Extraordinary genius and extraordinary inducements may also justify the departure from the ordinary custom of textual preaching. With this, however, I do not wish to be understood, that every festival and occasional sermon can do without the Bible text. Let us not forget the exhortation of our ecclesiastical superior, (Moll referred to above, §659) that the sermon, as an essential part of public worship, should not depend upon Quaker-like excitement, nor should unscriptural whims be countenanced in preaching; and in every single case, where we allow ourselves to depart from the rule, we will carefully examine whether it can be reconciled with that principle of order in worship, to which the apostle Paul refers (1 Cor. 14 : 40), and whether we do not injure the edificational interest, when we neglect to let the tones of the text just read enter the heart with their heavenly echo and their solemn impressiveness.

3. The third exception is created by sermons with those texts, which are not directly, rather indirectly, taken from the words of the Bible: such as sermons on the Catechism, the Augsburg Confession, on Hymns and the like. In all these cases it is advisable to place the biblical source

of the general text at the head as principal text, according to the example of Spener, who, in his later years, delivered sermons on "Arndt's True Christianity," and in the first sermon he says: "Your Christian love will prevent you from thinking, that I am about to preach on Arndt to you in a regular manner; I am rather going to preach to you about the Word of God, the texts of Scripture, but in the order in which this blessed man has treated of them. Thus we find too, at the head of every sermon, the Bible text of the particular chapter of Arndt. And in the sermon on the preface of the second book, Spener says: Because John Arndt has placed no special text to this preface, we will take the general passage, (Matt. 7: 14,) which he used for his three books, for our foundation. Spener knew how to avoid the imminent danger, that the text should be used only as device; but rather than that the Bible passage should be an assistant text only, it is certainly better to content oneself with the indirect Word of God, the text which the hymn, the catechism, etc., afford. Draeseke delivered the memorial sermon of Frederick William III, on the text: "*Was Gott thut, das ist wohl gethan*," (What God does, is done well). "This melody," he says, "may quiet the mourners, and characterize the departed, for according to this melody, the life of the king moved, namely: his mind, his action, his courage and his death." After announcing this hymn for his text, he remarks: "If in addition, you need an express Bible passage, then let it be the exhortation of the Old Testament: "Commit thy way unto the Lord; and He shall give thee the desires of thy heart;" let it be the Confession of the New Covenant: "The Lord hath done all things well." I ask now, did the sermon, because of this addition, become a sermon on a Bible text? Certainly not; but it is, and remains a sermon on the text of a hymn. Here it seems to me the question will be interposed, whether at all or not sermons are to be allowed on anything less than the direct Word of God. I shall not speak of the catechetical sermon any further, first, because the Lutheran Catechism contains in all but the second part, the direct Word of God, and secondly, because the most of practical ministers, if I am not mistaken, are satisfied of the usefulness of sermons on the Catechism. In the end, it is of less importance what harmonizes with the idea of protestant *cultus*, than what benefits the people. In this department,



the voice of a public school teacher, like Nissen, who, in the introduction to his excellent explanation of the Catechism, begs so urgently for Sermons on the Catechism, is to be respected as much as that of a theorizer like Ebrard, who wants to banish the Catechism from the Sermon entirely, because of its metanvetical purpose, and who is yet so inconsistent, as to admit, that since catechisation did not accomplish its object with every individual a certain metanvetical activity must work itself into *Cultus*. I am more concerned to rid the Sermon on hymns of the bad repute into which good theory and bad practice has brought it. As much as it is contrary to good taste, to announce the theme and the divisions in common poetry, and strange, that Ebrard can defend this sort of division, although he does it under the genteel name: "Lines that form a verse," just as much is it to be recommended, that now and then a good hymn of our Church, form the main trunk of a sermon. And, I venture to defend the hymn Sermon, although Nitzsch, also, declares himself against it, and asserts: "Sermons on church formula, hymns and the like, had occurred only then where the consciousness of the purpose of the Sermon had been lost." Whoever has intercourse with the people, know that the hymn-book is the lay-Bible, the *biblia pauperum*. The Bible Society may yet hold more than one jubilee before the people can read the Bible for private edification. A far higher degree of popular education is necessary to that effect, than has been attained thus far by our public schools, with and without regulation. The aged Dinter, who, as friend and foe must acknowledge, with his whole soul clung to the people, who thought, wrote, and worked for the people, has along with his Gospel postils, also published homilies on hymns. The principal argument for the evangelical pericopes, upon which, however, little stress is generally laid in the discussions for and against the pericopes, that, namely: the common people find the most edification in Sermons on texts which are familiar, is also favorable to Sermons upon the familiar hymns. From those times, in which the taste for hymns had not yet become so corrupt, we have several Sermons, as, for instance, one by Buronerus, (Salzwedel 1677) on the hymn of Hans Sachs: "Why art thou sad, my heart?" with the title—"House comfort for poor people;" one of Scriver in his *Seelenschatz*, (1680, II. pp. 786—845) on the hymn of Frank: "O, how worthless, O,

how brief," with the theme: "The vanity despised by believing souls." There are ten Sermons of Schleupner, with the title: "Blessed ascension of the saints," Leipzig, 1619," on the hymn: "When my hour has come," which has often furnished a funeral text in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Also, on the hymns: "*Gott sei Dank durch alle Welt*," "*Herr Jesu Christ, du höchstes Gut*," "*Wil schoen leuchtet der Morgenstern*," there are sermons upon record, as mentioned by Koch, in his history of Church Hymns, Vol. IV. pp. 121, 332, 397.

After we have now, by the grace of God, had restored unto us the church-hymn in all its original biblical power and fulness, it might be regarded as timely to acquaint the people more fully with this treasure in Sermons upon hymns, and, thus, also to contribute toward the understanding of the sacred Scriptures. But only such hymns are to be used, over which a passage of Scripture can be placed as a text, although I do not think it essential, that such should be done in all cases. Who would be offended, if I were to announce a Sermon on the 130th Psalm, and would read this Psalm as Luther has given it to us in the hymn: "In deep distress I cry to Thee?" For Dr. Nicolaus Selnecker, one of the co-workers in getting up the Formula of Concord, in explaining this Psalm, did not use the Bible text, but Luther's hymn version of it. The text: "In our poor flesh and blood is clothed the eternal Good," would be suitable for Christmas Sermons, as was once admitted in the *Ev. Gemeindeblatt*, and a congregation would not complain if one would preach on that text from year to year. Still this class of Sermons without Bible texts, though they be ever so well fortified with the Word of God, must be regarded as exceptions to the rule. For no collection of hymns, no symbolical book, can be placed upon a level with the Word of God, the "Scriptures given by inspiration of God." "There is a majesty in the sacred Scriptures, that inspires fear, and makes all those who have forsaken the right paths to tremble; but to them who carry it in their hearts, it gives sweet rest," (Justin Martyr). "For faith cometh by preaching, and preaching by the Word of God," (Rom. 10: 17.)

Still, if we would investigate the relation which the Bible text sustains to the Sermon, we must not only inquire *whether*, but also *how* the Sermon is bound to the Bible text. In this relation, I would give four homiletical

rules. The Sermon must be (1) textual, (text gemäß,) (2) related to the text, (text verwandt,) (3) exhaustive of the text, (text erschöpfend,) and (4) mastering the text, (text beherrschend).

*Textuality* requires, that we do not leave the text untouched, and what is yet more important, that we do not wrest the Scriptures, but preach the Word of God in its purity, nor bring things into the text, which were as far from the mind of the writer, as heaven is from earth, though they may otherwise be biblical and true. Allegorical explanations of the text, are forbidden by this Canon in a general way; allegory is allowable only in cases, where either the text indicates it, as in the Epistle for *Lætare*, and in the Gospel for that day, at the close: "This is indeed the Prophet who was to come into the world," as also the following parable justifies it, that we understand the bread to be the symbol of the Word of God, or when the ancient custom of the Church, and the reference of the pericope to the season of the year points to a parabolic signification. Thus, for instance, the Gospel of the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem, has, on the Sunday before Easter, been explained historically, and on the first Sunday in Advent allegorically, and the parable of the good Samaritan has been applied to Christ. But an arbitrary allegorizing is to be rejected, because it does violence to the text. The child-like simplicity of faith, and the hearty love of Jesus, which characterized a Valerius Herberger, we may imitate, but not his allegorical interpretations, as when at the two pieces of wood which the woman of Zarephath picked up, (1 Kings 17 : 12,) he thinks of the two cross-pieces of the Cross of Christ. To this textuality also belongs, that we do not only select the real foundation thought of the text, and, that our division be suitable to the text, but, that we also remain true to the text, as our guiding star in our train of thought during the whole Sermon. That Sermon is not textual, of which one familiar with the Scriptures could hear a whole sub-division, or read a whole page, and still remain in uncertainty as to what text it was based upon.

As to *being related to the text*, (text verwandtschaft,) I mean by that not only, that sermons on texts of the Old and New Testaments, on the Gospel or the Epistle, on prose or poetic texts, should have their own and peculiar coloring, although it may also be in place to remind of that.

It is hard to comprehend how one could preach of the glory of the Evangelical Church on a text taken from Isaiah, or point out the requisites of the evangelical justification of faith, in the writings of Moses. I regard that as a confounding of the Old and New Testaments. If any one should appeal to the saying of Augustine: *N. T. latet in Vetere. Vetus patet in Novo*, I would answer: True, indeed, but not *Novum T. patet in Vetere*. But this text relationship means more, namely: that we do not shun the highly important and fine mental labor to work ourselves into the whole spirit and meaning of the individual writer, and place ourselves into a relationship with him, that we do not only interpret his word to the congregation in his own mind, but may also be enabled to let his soul speak with additional testimony. The Sermon must not remain behind the sciences, and in our day, when we have learned to distinguish between the doctrinal conception of a Paul, a Peter, a John, and that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Sermons, that are in general biblical, are not sufficient. With all the essential unity of The Holy Scriptures, he who would preach in a Pauline spirit, on a text taken from the Epistle of James, would manifest that he had taken a wrong text. I go still further. Every Epistle of the Apostle Paul has its own peculiar character, that must have its expression in the sermon. On a text from the Epistle to the Galatians, although that may have its isolated tender passages, I cannot preach with the same heartiness and love, the same joyful emotion, that I can upon a text taken from the Epistle to the Philippians. It is on this account, that many sermons are useless and ineffective, not as Sulze thinks, because they are based on passages of Scripture, but because they are delivered in a distorted Scriptural language; it is not the language of David, not that of Isaiah, not that of the Synoptics, not that of John; it has ceased to be Bible language, because it is not individually biblical. So far as the synoptic Gospels are concerned, I cannot say, that I believe the peculiarity of the individual Evangelist to be lost, and, therefore, not to be noticed in the pulpit. In Lent Sermons, I consider it a falsification and a distorting of the Bible text, if, instead of taking the words of the history of Christ's sufferings, as given by Matthew, or Mark, or Luke, or John, as a foundation, one would take his text out of the first best Gospel Harmony, and, for instance, would preach on the

exclamation of the Centurion under the Cross, in the given words: "Truly this was a good man and the Son of God." That would be no Bible text at all, and the same is true of so many compilations. I either preach, according to Matthew (27 : 54,) on: "Truly this was the Son of God," or according to Mark (15 : 39,) on: "Truly this man was the Son of God," or according to Luke (23 : 47,) on: "Certainly this was a righteous man." Each of these three texts, gives for three years different sermons, in which the same truth, as it is differently reflected in the soul of the individual evangelist, appears with different shades of meaning. In the first sermon, upon the reading according to the peculiarity of Matthew, that particular which places the universality of the Gospel and the advantage of the heathen in a prominent light, were to be especially noticed, which can be done in reference to the fact, that the *heathen* centurion, and those with him, acknowledged him who was crucified by the Jews as the Son of God. The second Sermon should then, according to the peculiarity of Mark which is mirrored forth in the addition ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παριστηκὼς ἐκ ἰστανίας αὐτοῦ, give a dramatic representation of the occurrence, and the powerful contrast between a mere man and the Son of God, as it becomes prominent in the crucifixion of Jesus, and in the accompanying miracles that make such deep impression upon the centurion, to which the especial attention is to be directed. And the third Sermon would extol the righteousness of God which honors suffering innocence, according to that peculiarity of Luke, who has the expression ἰδοὺ αὐτὸν added to the text verse. There would be other themes that could be drawn from this text of Luke, e. g. The pious human part (*Das fromme Menschliche*), in the death of Jesus,—in consideration of the fact, that Luke gives the genealogy of Christ, and refers it back to the first man, and through him to God, in order to exhibit Jesus as the second Adam, and, also, that Luke alone gives more accurate accounts of the childhood of Jesus; or, "How the glorification of Jesus, as the good man, gives us a powerful impression, that we are sinful beings." For Luke is the Evangelist, who alone has the addition: "they smote their breasts and returned," (48,) and who also alone has the account of the miraculous draught of fishes, (5 : 1—11,) with the characteristic confession of Peter: "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord." What,

then, I want to say, is this: the physiognomy of that Evangelist who has given us the text, should be recognizable in our Sermon. The most general departure from this text relationship, that can be allowed, is in the case of those sententious passages, for whose general truth it is of no importance, or at least, of a subordinate importance, through whom the Holy Ghost uttered them; the least allowable is with Sermons on a whole book of the Bible, in its connected relation. Whoever undertakes to preach on the Gospel of John, and has not lain on Jesus' breast, or on the Revelation of John, and has not been in the Spirit of the Lord on the the Lord's Day, lacks the necessary fitness for such Sermons. But, if any one should ask, whether this *text relationship* of the Sermon should go so far as to preach an obscure Sermon on an obscure text, I would prefer to let Augustine give the answer to this question. He says: "No. For the interpreters of Scripture must not speak as though they undertook to express themselves in such a way as to give the appearance, that they need to be explained again, but they should above all things labor, that they may be understood in all their speaking, so far as that can be done by means of a plain exhibition of the truth, so that, he who does not understand it, is either of a very weak mind, or that the difficulty, lies rather in the depth and subtlety of the subject to be explained, than that which we speak is less understood, or with more difficulty."

I now come to the duty of the preacher to *exhaust* his text. Only a relative exhausting of the text is, of course, possible, according to our ability, and the special object of the Sermon; an absolute exhausting of the text would necessitate every following Sermon on the same text, to be a mere repetition. But, not only the Bible as a whole, but also, every single text, is like unto the starry sky; the longer we look into it, the more stars become visible to us, If the Sermon is made with a living reference to present circumstances, and if the preacher grows from year to year, in wisdom and grace, he will, in repeating an exhaustive Sermon on the same text, be like unto the household-er "who bringeth forth, out of his treasury, things new and old," and be secure against the digression, that allows the theme and its development to occupy itself with extraneous matters, and not reach the case. I regard the

Sermons of Rud. Stier as models, with reference to exhausting the text. We should always look upon the text before us, as though we had never preached on it before, and as though we never intended to preach on it again. To this part also, belongs the question, whether it be allowable to place more than one text at the foundation of one and the same sermon. I regard this as questionable, on the ground that, in that case, no one text can be treated exhaustively. It also occurs, that where two texts are combined, they are placed in a false light, and, that their signification, which they had in their original connection, is altered. If, for example, the account of our Lord's temptation should be combined with a second text, as James 1 : 14, "But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed," it would be nothing less than blasphemy. It is, however, not out of place to cite, or read whole passages of Scripture, besides the regular text, at suitable points during the Sermon, as Bengel did at times, "because one must not pre-suppose as much knowledge of Scripture with the people, as is generally done, and Bible passages are the best and most edifying to the sincere hearer, who seeks salvation." In such a procedure, which, also, Draeseke followed at times, we disavow, from the start, any exhaustive treatment of those extra texts.

The next step, which the Sermon, in its relation to the text, can take, I have designated by the requirement, that it must *control* the text. The more a preacher has allowed his meditation to be controlled by the text, the more will the text in mental reproduction become his own free property, which, far from binding him, becomes a sword of the Spirit in his mouth, and a balm in his hand. The preacher, who has mastered his text, is not a slave to his textual disposition, but all things are at his disposal, be it Paul or Apollos, be it Cephas or the world, be it life or death, be it things present or things to come. The striking and fitting application of the text to the times, its culture and pretences, to the Church and school, to the church year, to the congregation and its circumstances, will all offer itself unsought, to the preacher, who has mastered his text. On the most general text he can preach in a very special manner, and on the most special text he can preach in a very general manner; he is far from tedious and tiresome repetitions, and yet true to the principle of A. H.



Francke: "Every Sermon should have, at least, so much of the way of salvation in it, that if one should hear only this single sermon, it would be enough to lead him to salvation." Not independence of the text, as the preaching of our times strives to become, but being freed by the text—let that be our aim, in order that we, as those who are free indeed, can also set others free from the law of sin and death, and, as those built upon the right foundation, can also build others up in Jesus Christ. Homiletical arts and rules are scarcely needed in order to edify our generation, but there must be something of the Spirit manifest in the Sermon, which cannot be achieved without much mental labor and prayer. This mastery of the text considered with unction: The sermon itself becomes a *textus sacer*, or as Novalis says: "A fraction of the Bible, and, that even of the canonical part of the Bible, producing inspiration," and we may cease to preach, and leave the further work to the Holy Ghost. To reach this ideal of the Sermon's relation to the text, that is, the object to be aimed at; and the older we become, and the oftener we have preached, and heard the call again and again, *Preach*, the more we realize how far we are from the true standard; I, for my own part conclude, with the confession of Jeremiah: "O, Lord, Lord, I am not fit to preach, for I am too young."

---

## ARTICLE VII.

PATRICK HENRY.\*

By W. B. SPRAGUE, D. D., LL. D., Albany, N. Y.

It is a signal proof of the wisdom of Providence, that whenever there is a great end to be accomplished, the fitting instruments are always at hand. I know not where to look for a more striking illustration of this remark, than is furnished by the history of that great national struggle, that gave us our independence. It was, indeed, a mighty

---

\* Delivered by the author on several occasions, and, at the request of the Editor, presented to the readers of the *Evangelical Review*.

end, that was to be accomplished : it was not merely, that a tyrant's arm was to be resisted, or, that a nation's freedom was to be established, but there was to be a noble example set, that should tell through all future ages upon the destinies of the world. And, when the fulness of time for this great event had come, there was found a race of giants in the land—men who were every way qualified, not only to project a mighty enterprise, but to conduct it to a favorable issue. How far they were originally constituted great with reference to the exigency they were destined to meet, and how far they became great through the influences of the circumstances in which they were placed, it is not necessary now to inquire; but, as to the fact, that they towered above the men of almost any other period, in respect to wisdom and valor and might, there is no room for question. In a few years they accomplished more for the civil regeneration of the race, than had been accomplished by the whole world during the lapse of centuries. Their history is the history of lofty purposes and noble deeds. Their names are as imperishable as the result of their labors is glorious.

Of these great spirits, one of the greatest, in some respects, the very greatest was PATRICK HENRY. I purpose to present some brief sketches of his character; but brief they must necessarily be, to be included within the space allotted to me. His public life was one of almost incessant occupation; and if you would have a minute detail of the events by which it was marked, you can consult his eloquent biographers. All that I shall attempt will be to hold him up in two or three different characters, selecting facts to illustrate them, here and there from the history of his life. For most of the incidents that I shall state, I shall rely on the authority of Wirt; though a portion of them have been gathered from other sources, especially from one of the most venerable and eminent clergymen in this country, now deceased, who was personally acquainted with Henry, and for some time exercised his ministry in his immediate neighborhood.

Let me speak of Patrick Henry then, in the first place, as a *self-made man*. In most cases, where men attain to great eminence by their unassisted efforts, it is not difficult to find some decided prognostics of this in their early tastes and habits. But, if such prognostics existed in the case of Henry, they were at least so remote and obscure as

to have escaped general observation. A glance at his early life will sufficiently illustrate this remark.

He was born of respectable, but not opulent parents, in the year 1736; his father having emigrated from Scotland to Virginia, some five or six years before. The vocation of his father was, temporarily at least, that of a school-master; and it was from him, that Patrick learned the elements of grammar and mathematics. But he is represented, as having been at that period, an excessively idle and unpromising boy, manifesting a strong aversion to books, and seeking his enjoyment chiefly in rural sports and solitary rambles. As he evinced no desire for a liberal education, his father placed him, at the age of about fifteen, in a neighboring counting house, with a view to his engaging in mercantile pursuits; and, after a year's apprenticeship, he and his brother, who was even more indolent than himself, formed a partnership, and commenced business for themselves. Being kept now in a great measure from his accustomed sports in the field, he resorted for amusement to his violin; and soon became as passionately devoted to this, as he had been to the other. The affairs of the firm, as might have been anticipated, went badly enough; and, at the end of the year, the concern was given up as an utter failure. Having now, at the age of eighteen, formed a matrimonial connection with a farmer's daughter in the neighborhood, in moderate circumstances, he resolved on trying his hand at farming; and, accordingly, the new married couple settled down on a small patch of ground, that had been provided for them, assisted by one or two slaves, intending literally to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. But it turned out, that Henry had not more skill as a farmer than a merchant; and, after the experiment of a year, he sold his property at considerable loss, and again found himself without any stated employment. As, however, it was absolutely necessary, that he should do something for the support of his family, he resolved to make one more trial at mercantile life; and, accordingly, he purchased a few goods, and became again the master of a little establishment. But, as there had been no change in the mode of conducting business, it was not strange, that substantially the same result should have been realized—within two years he was obliged to give up the concern in utter bankruptcy. After having had such a measure of disappointment meted out to him, it would

have been no marvel, if he had sunk irrecoverably under it; but, it was just at this point, that the energy of his spirit began to awake; and, though he had yet no adequate idea of his own powers, he felt the necessity of exertion in *some* way; and he resolved upon the study of the Law. After having pursued this study a few months, or as some say, only a single month, he offered himself a candidate for admission to the bar; and, after an examination, which, in some respects, he sustained very imperfectly, he succeeded in obtaining his license. Up to the period of his commencing the study of the Law, at least, one would be ready to imagine, that there was little that betokened self-culture, even in the lowest degree—on the contrary, it would rather have appeared, that he was training himself to be a burden to society; but we shall see, as we advance, that even amidst all these apparently untoward indications, a process was going forward in the silent workings of the spirit, which was to result in a degree of intellectual development, which should be the wonder of the world.

It must be acknowledged, that in one respect, Patrick Henry had greatly the advantage of most other self-made men—his Creator had supplied him with better materials to work upon, in a mind so pre-eminently fertile and original, that it threw even most other great minds into the shade. There are those, who will have it, that all the diversities of intellectual character that exist among men, are to be referred to the influence of circumstances; and, that Heaven bestows her gifts originally with an equal hand. But the least observation upon human character, brands this notion as an idle dream—there is not a greater original diversity in the human countenance, than in the human mind—the man whom we are contemplating, if he had lived and died in the deepest obscurity, would have still been originally and essentially a great man: the elements of might and majesty would have been in his soul, however he might himself have been unconscious of them to his dying day. Had he received from his Creator, nothing more than ordinary intellectual gifts, a diligent course of self-culture, might have rendered him not only respectable and useful, but even eminent; but no amount of effort could have ever made him what he was, if he had not been among the most eminently favored in his intellectual constitution.

If we look a little more narrowly into his early history,

we shall, if I mistake not, easily detect the process of self training, by which his faculties became so wonderfully developed. In the apparently idle boy, in the shop-keeper in love with his violin, in the farmer trudging about upon his stinted patch, in the youthful bankrupt, rushing, as if in desperation, into the profession of the Law, when he had scarcely had time to master the elements of the science—in all these various characters we shall find, that the germ of his subsequent greatness was silently developing itself; and *that* in several different ways.

He appears, for instance, from his earliest childhood, to have been remarkable for a habit of observation. Notwithstanding, he had an utter aversion to books, he was a most diligent observer of men. He was fond of being present where several individuals were carrying on an animated conversation—no matter what the subject might be; and though he would sit in silence, and seem scarcely to notice what was said, yet it would subsequently be found, that not a word had escaped him, and, that he could relate the whole, with perfect accuracy. And the same disposition was evinced, still more strikingly at a later period, especially while he was trying his fortune as a merchant. He was constantly making experiments, with a view to ascertain the character of his customers. He not only noted particularly whatever they might say, in ordinary intercourse, but he took special pains to give such a direction to their conversation, as would be most likely to elicit their peculiarities of character. He would relate anecdotes, not unfrequently, that were apocryphal and of his own originating; and would sometimes personate different characters, and make sham speeches, for no other purpose than that he might observe the effect produced upon his auditors, as it was manifested not only through their lips, but by their countenances. In all this, it is not to be supposed, that he had the slightest idea of cultivating his own powers, with reference to a future, glorious destiny—it was really nothing more than obedience to a strong instinctive impulse;—but, after all, it was the means which Providence was using to reveal the giant to himself, and ultimately to reveal him in all his strength and majesty to the world.

In this habit of close observation, which was maintained in all circumstances, and even amidst the development of some apparently untoward dispositions, lay, to a great ex-

tent, the secret of his ultimate eminence; for it was his ability to read the character of men under every variety of influence, that made him so continually sought for, not only as a legal advocate, but a councillor in the higher concerns of state, and, that rendered him through life, more than almost any other man, the terror of his adversaries. Indeed, this kind of knowledge always gives a man more power over his fellow men, than any other; and, though, like every thing else, it is capable of being perverted, and often is perverted to the basest purposes, yet, in its legitimate application, it ministers most effectually to the noblest interests of men. It is a kind of knowledge, which, in its higher degrees, is not to be gained from books—the volume chiefly to be studied, is the heart itself, either as it lies shut up in one's own bosom, or as it is revealed in the tenor of the life. Whosoever will, may come to this fountain of knowledge, and drink freely; and whosoever avails himself of this privilege, as he may, even though he be an exile from the world of letters, will be sure to have no mean intellectual growth; and, if circumstances should ever furnish the opportunity, marvel not if he shows himself a great man.

Notwithstanding, Henry, in his earliest years, manifested a strong aversion to books, that aversion seems to have been gradually overcome, as he approached his maturity; and, we find him, even during the period of his mercantile and agricultural life, occupying portions of his leisure in reading translations of some of the Greek and Latin classics. His favorite author, seems to have been Livy; and, so enamoured was he with that noble history, that he is said to have read it through attentively once a year, for many successive years; and, some have imagined, that to this circumstance, were to be referred those noble traits of Roman character, for which, in after life, he was so much distinguished. But the point to which I wish more particularly to advert, is, that his reading, if not very abundant, was very select, and, that he never laid aside a book, until he had become thoroughly possessed of every thing valuable that it contained. It is the prevalence of a spirit the opposite to this—the rage for light and superficial reading—that gives to the present age, in many respects, a dwarfish and sickly intellectual character.

But any view of the progress, by which the mind of this great man was trained, would be very imperfect, that should

not involve the influence of circumstances; for, notwithstanding he was a self-made man, his own efforts were, in a great measure, both dictated and aided by the peculiar situations, in which he was placed. His occupation as a store keeper furnished a fine opportunity for him to make observations upon character—a habit so essentially identified with all his greatness. His ill success as a farmer and a merchant, in connection with the necessity of providing for a rising family, gave him the first impulse towards the Law—the profession in which he was destined to earn some of his brightest laurels. And then, again, the peculiar condition of the country, making ready to resist the arm of the oppressor, and to stand before the world in the dignity of acknowledged independence, was just what was necessary to bring out those qualities, which are essential to the highest statesmanship. How far his character might have been varied by having been developed under different circumstances, it is impossible to decide; but it is easy to see, that the circumstances in which he was actually placed, even those which seemed the most inauspicious, were providentially arranged with admirable reference to what he was to be, and what he was to do, during an eventful life.

Having exhibited him as a self-made man, let me ask you to contemplate him next as a *matchless orator*. That he really *was* one of the greatest orators of modern times, is put beyond all question, not only by general tradition, but by the testimony of individuals very recently deceased, who listened to him, and were perfectly competent judges of his eloquence. Jefferson, who was long his contemporary and associate in public life, and who, from the circumstances in which he was placed, must have been familiar with the finest models of eloquence, both at the bar and in the senate house, has declared not only, that he was the first orator to whom he ever listened, the first orator of the time in which he lived, but the first which the world ever saw. Admitting even that this opinion savors somewhat of extravagance, yet, the very fact, that such an opinion could have been expressed by such a man, is proof enough of the superlative greatness of the powers that called it forth. The history of his eloquence, is incorporated with the history of his country—it is to be found, not merely on those pages which directly describe the orator's



power, as evinced by the effect which he produced, but in those institutions which had their origin in measures which he was among the first to suggest, or defend.

In a conversation with the venerable clergyman, to whom I referred, as having furnished me with some interesting details of Henry's life, I received from him an account of the effect which his eloquence produced upon his own mind, on the trial of three men charged with the crime of murder. He stated, that that was the only time, that he ever heard him address a jury; that it was nearly night, when the time for the opening of the trial came; and, that it became a question with the court, whether it should not be deferred till the next day. Henry, who was engaged for the defence, rose and said with the utmost simplicity and solemnity of manner, that as the business to which they were next to proceed, was the most important which they could be called to transact on earth, involving the question, whether the probation of three human beings should, or should not, be continued, and, as he should not be able to finish the defence that evening, and for some other reasons also, should speak at a disadvantage, he thought it was due to the magnitude of the interests involved, that the trial should be put off till the next morning. The effect which this simple statement produced on the mind of my informant, may be seen from the following extract of a letter which he afterwards wrote me, in compliance with a request, that he would furnish me with some of his recollections of that extraordinary man. I shall make no apology for the length of the extract, as it contains the opinion concerning his eloquence of a most competent judge, and one of the most distinguished of our American clergymen.

In referring to the trial of which he had before given me some account, he writes: "I was told, that he did not exert his power over the passions, to the extent that he commonly did on similar occasions; and the reason assigned by a very judicious man who knew him well, was, that he was aware, that every man in the community was on his guard against this blinding influence. I am not able to express on paper, the impression I received of his sincerity, when he first rose to speak; and, that was the point which, above all others, I was solicitous to ascertain. My conviction, that every word which he spoke, was from the bottom of his heart, deeply impressed with

the weight of his cause, was instantaneous and perfect. And I never entertained a doubt afterwards, that he entered so deeply into the feelings of his clients, and sympathized so perfectly with them, that all the emotion he ever manifested was real; and on this evident, earnest sincerity, his power over a jury greatly depended. There was never any appearance of artifice about the man. He was uniformly serious, and seemed to enter simply, and with all his soul, into the business in which he was engaged. He undoubtedly possessed an insight into the human heart that was peculiar, and a power so to fill the mind of his hearers with his own ideas, that every thing else was, for the time, obliterated from the mind. A judicious friend of mine, who heard him defend a criminal in New London, Virginia, informed me, that when the State's Attorney had finished his speech, and had descanted on the evidence, everything appeared so plain, that he could not conceive what could be said with the smallest plausibility on the other side; and he waited with curiosity to hear what Henry would reply. Instead of attacking the arguments of the Attorney General, he went off in a beautiful and striking description of something, which had only a remote connection with the subject, until he had expelled from the minds of his hearers every vestige of proof, which had been advanced. And, when he had, by this means, completely erased the impression made by the former speech, he made his own statement—coming to the point, however, by degrees, and after, by various hints and innuendoes, he had prepared the jury to receive his statements.

The power of the orator to possess the minds of his hearers so completely with his own thoughts, to the exclusion, for the time, of all others, was a faculty far more important than the ability to move the passions of his hearers; and, by this, he influenced the minds of the intelligent and well informed, as much as the vulgar. I experienced something of this in the trial which I attended. The proof of the murder was positive, and the principal witness was one Harvey, a large, likely man, and of reputable character. In the course of the evidence, various circumstances respecting the man, which were merely incidental, were brought to view. Out of these hints, the orator formed a fictitious character of the man, and made so great a matter of little circumstances, and pointed his long crooked finger so often at him, and looked upon him

with such ineffable contempt, that before he had finished, I felt the conviction arising in my mind, that not the smallest credit was due to the testimony of that man. But this conviction vanished, as soon as I had the opportunity of reflection. Another instance of this kind I will mention, which I received from General Thomas Posey, a personal friend of Washington—a man of great dignity, and and sound, cool judgment. He was a decided friend of the Federal Constitution, the merits of which, were then under discussion in the Virginia Convention. He was not a member; but being in Richmond to hear the debates, he was present when Henry made his great speech, an account of which, you have in Wirt. Though not a man susceptible of strong impressions; and usually very fixed in his opinions, yet, he told me, when he returned home, that, while Henry was speaking, he was as fully convinced, as he ever was of anything, that if the constitution was adopted, the country was ruined.

If you ask for the secret of this power, I can only say, that Henry's emotions were vivid, to an unusual degree; and he possessed a power of expressing emotion, which no other man that I ever heard possessed. When in a high state of excitement, his tones, his gestures, his looks, his attitudes, his pauses, were all inimitable; and yet, they were understood and felt by every hearer. In the course of the evidence, on the trial to which I have referred, it was testified, that Harvey had said, in answer to a challenge—I can whip you, in a moment, you vile scoundrel. These words he repeated over and over again, using the identical words of the witness; but in a tone and manner expressive of the strongest anger. I often attempted, afterwards, to imitate his tone, but found that I could not approximate towards it. If he could have commanded a verdict immediately after speaking, before there was time for reflection, he must have gained every cause." Thus far my informant.

There were various occasions in Henry's life, on which he exerted his remarkable powers, with an effect, that would seem almost incredible. The time will permit me to advert to only two of his celebrated speeches, the one, evincing his powers as a lawyer, the other, his power as a statesman.

The former, was his well known speech in the cause which has always been familiarly known in Virginia, as *the parson's cause*. As the history of this affair may not

be familiar to all, a few words of explanation may be necessary to render the case intelligible, and to make one appreciate Henry's great effort. At this period the Episcopal form of worship was established by law in Virginia, as it is in Great Britain, at this day. By a statute of the colony, originally passed in 1696, and re-enacted in 1748, the salary of each parish minister was placed at sixteen thousand pounds of tobacco; which he might demand in the article itself, or might receive in any other way that should suit his convenience. The market price of tobacco, for a long time, remained stationary at sixteen shillings and eight pence the hundred; and, the clergy were in the habit of receiving their salary in a money payment, calculated on this basis.

In 1755, in consequence of a partial failure of the crop of tobacco, the price of the article suddenly increased about fourfold; and the Legislature, in order to secure the planters against great loss, passed a law, authorizing them to pay in money such of their debts as were due in tobacco, at the same rate, at which the article had been held in preceding years. The law went immediately into effect, and continued in force for ten months, without the usual clause suspending its operation, till it should receive the royal assent; and, during this period, it is not known that any of the clergy objected to it. Three years after, in 1758, in anticipation of another light crop of tobacco, the Legislature re-enacted the law of 1755, omitting, as before, any recognition of the royal authority. At this, the clergy took the alarm; and a vigorous pamphlet warfare was commenced, in which, were enlisted some of the ablest pens in the colony; the clergy maintaining, that the colonial laws were not valid, without the royal assent, and, therefore, they retained all the rights vested in them by the act of 1748; and, the planters urged the injustice of attempting to extort from them, in a time of scarcity, three or four times the amount, which even the statute to which they appealed, as having fixed their salary, had ever contemplated. The affair having been brought before the king in council, it was decided, that the act of 1758, for want of the royal assent, was not valid; and, immediately upon this, the clergy undertook to enforce their alleged claims by legal process. The first action that was brought, and that which furnished Henry the opportunity of immortalizing himself, was by the Rev. James Maury; though

this was quickly followed by many others, which, however, after the result of the first, were all withdrawn.

In this case of Maury, the plaintiff pleaded the statute of 1748, and the defendant that of 1758; but the plaintiff, in reply to the defendant, maintained, that this latter act, could in no wise effect the plaintiff's claim, inasmuch as it had not only never received the royal sanction, but had actually been declared null and void by the king in council. The legal question, which was argued at the November Term of 1763, was decided in favor of the clergy; and it only remained for the jury to give the damages; which was regarded as little more than a mere matter of form, as the amount was supposed to be decided by the statute of 1748. With a view to this, the action was continued; and Mr. Lewis, who had hitherto managed the cause for the defendants, having retired, considering that it was already actually brought to a close, Henry was retained as counsel, with a view to argue the question of damages before the jury.

The day for the trial at length arrived—it was the first day of December, 1763; and rarely has there ever been an array of circumstances better fitted to embarrass and intimidate a young lawyer, than existed in connection with this occasion, in reference to Henry. He was then but twenty-seven years of age, and until then, his voice had never been heard in open Court. The case was one, that had excited the strongest interest throughout the colony; and even at that late stage of the proceedings, when the question was generally regarded as virtually settled in favor of the clergy, an immense throng had assembled to hear the final issue. Henry's own father was the presiding magistrate of the Court. A large number of the clergy were present, perfectly confident of the complete and ultimate triumph of their cause. Among those who came, was the Rev. Patrick Henry, an uncle of the orator, who, had himself, an action then pending, similar to that which was then finally to be decided. Wirt relates the following anecdote, in reference to the meeting, which took place between Henry and his uncle at the Court House. Henry approached his uncle, expressing his regret at seeing him there. "Why so,"—inquired the uncle. "Because," replied Henry, "I fear, that as I have never yet spoken in public, I shall be too much overawed by your presence, to do justice to my clients." "Besides," he add-

ed, "I shall be under the necessity of saying some hard things of the clergy, which it may be unpleasant to you to hear." His uncle now censured him for having undertaken the case on the side of the planters; which Henry excused by saying: "That he had no offer from the clergy; and, that independently of this, his own heart and judgment were on the side of the people." He then requested his uncle to leave the ground. "Why, Patrick," said the old gentleman, with a good natured smile, "as to your saying hard things of the clergy, I advise you to be cautious, as you will be more likely to injure your own cause than theirs. As to my leaving the ground, I fear, my boy, that with such a case to defend, my presence will do you but little harm or good. Since, however, you seem to think otherwise, and desire it of me so earnestly, you shall be gratified." He then entered his carriage, and returned home.

Shortly after the opening of the Court, the cause was called; when Mr. Lyons, the counsel for the plaintiff, introduced it by a short speech, the object of which, was to show that, as the previous decision of the Court had set aside the act of 1758, nothing remained but that they should regulate the amount of damages by the act of 1748; and, having done this, and then dealt out some very fulsome compliments upon the clergy, he took his seat. Henry rose to reply—little dreaming, that the speech he was about to make, was to stamp his character as an orator, with the seal of immortality. His personal appearance was awkward, forbidding, clownish; and the first few sentences that he uttered, gave promise of nothing but utter failure. His father, the presiding officer whom he had to address, showed evident signs of extreme mortification; his friends around him, and the friends of the cause which he had undertaken to defend, hung their heads in anticipation of a disastrous result; while the clergy and those who favored their claims, were observed to brighten up with exultation, and to exchange significant nods, in the full confidence that a complete triumph awaited them. But not many minutes had passed, before the disheartened and the triumphant began to exchange places. Henry's stammering was cured by the time that he had finished his exordium; and, he who had just stood before them, with apparently all the attributes of a clown, was transformed, as if by magic, into the most eloquent orator, to

whom they had ever listened. The account of the scene, from those who were witnesses, would seem scarcely to be within the limits of credibility; and yet, so many competent judges have concurred in it, that all must concede, that it was one of the most extraordinary efforts in the history of forensic eloquence. The countenance of the orator became radiant with an almost superhuman illumination; the awkward form stood erect with the utmost grace and manliness; the gestures characterized alike by simplicity and majesty, were evidently in harmony with the mighty movements of the soul; the eye was like the lightning's flash; the voice now entranced by its melody, and now overawed by its power. Nor was the speech less distinguished for its matter than its manner: the argument was lucid, powerful, irresistible; the appeals to the passions were such, as none but a perfect master could have safely attempted; and the effect was, that both the intellect and the heart were carried by storm. The audience were thrown into a sort of phrenzy of admiration. The immense crowd, occupying not only every particle of room in the court house, even to the window seats, but also the passage into the house, and the space around the door, were bending forward and gazing with astonishment at the orator, as if they were contemplating the features, and listening to the voice of a being from some brighter world. Before he had proceeded far in his speech, the clergy made their way through the crowd out of the house; indignant at the torrent of eloquent, burning invective, that was poured out upon them, and disappointed and mortified in the certain prospect of their defeat. As soon as the argument was closed, the jury, without leaving their seats, returned a verdict of one penny damages; and, though a motion was immediately made for a new trial, the court overruled it; both the court and the jury being well nigh bewildered by the scene that had been passing. Notwithstanding the most vigorous attempts of the Sheriff and his assistants to preserve order, Henry was actually taken up by the multitude, and carried on their shoulders, out of the house and around the yard, as the highest expression of gratitude, admiration and triumph; and, it was some time, before even his own earnest expostulations availed to his being set at liberty. The result of this trial put an end to the general controversy, to which it related; and though many other of the clergy had actually commenced



similar prosecutions, they were almost immediately withdrawn, their case having been rendered, by this extraordinary effort, absolutely hopeless. Notwithstanding this was Henry's first appearance as an advocate, and though it was the beginning of a glorious and somewhat protracted career, as a lawyer, it may reasonably be doubted, whether he ever exceeded this first effort, perhaps even whether he ever quite reached it, in any subsequent effort of his brilliant course.

We have seen what he was at the bar—let us now contemplate him as a parliamentary orator: and, here again, we can select but a single example or two, to illustrate his admirable powers. Let me refer you to his celebrated speech before the General Assembly of Virginia, occasioned by the Stamp Act.

Notwithstanding, at the close of the old French war, in 1763, the state of feeling in the American Colonies towards the mother country, was, perhaps, more loyal and specific, than it had been at almost any other period, yet, it was not long before an oppressive spirit, on the part of Great Britain, began to discover itself; and, the celebrated Stamp Act, which had been preceded by a declaratory resolution at a previous session of Parliament, and was actually passed in the year 1765, roused, in the Colonies a sense of injury, a spirit of indignation, that ere long developed itself in open resistance. Virginia, in connection with Massachusetts, had the honor of taking the lead in the glorious struggle; and, Henry was the man fixed upon by the Old Dominion, to ride in the approaching whirlwind, and direct the gathering storm. He was, accordingly, chosen a member of the House of Burgesses, for the year 1765; and when he came to take his seat in an assembly, in which were the Pendletons, the Lees, the Randolphs, and many others of the most accomplished and elegant men of the day, his coarse and slovenly appearance, formed rather a striking contrast with their cultivated and courtly manners; but, as his powers, as a public speaker, had already been tried and proved, no misgiving was felt on account of his forbidding exterior. It was soon discovered, that Henry's notions of resistance to oppression, were greatly in advance of those of nearly all who constituted the Assembly; the great mass thinking, that it was better to wait for some more decisive action on the part of the Crown, before pro-

ceeding to any decisive measures, while *he* believed, that the time for open resistance had already come. This diversity of opinion gave rise to a debate of great length and powerful eloquence; in which, Henry figured with matchless energy and brilliancy. Finding, that none of the older members were likely to introduce anything that came up to his views of the necessity of the case, he, at length, brought forward his celebrated resolutions, utterly denying the right of Great Britain to tax the Colonies, and declaring every attempt to do this, adapted to destroy, not only American, but British freedom. The resolutions met with the most violent opposition, and the projector of them was grossly abused, and even threatened by the party in favor of submission; but such was the power of his eloquence, that the opposition so far melted away, that when, after a protracted discussion, the vote came to be taken, there was found a majority in favor of the resolutions. Whether this was Henry's greatest parliamentary effort, we do not pretend to say; but it may safely be said, that no other ever imprinted itself more indelibly on the destinies of his country; for the news of the result flew with almost electric rapidity through all the Colonies, and awakened everywhere the spirit of resistance to British taxation; and this, as every one knows, led on to the war that gave us our independence. It is much to be regretted, that of the speech or speeches made by Henry on this occasion, no satisfactory record has been preserved; with the exception of a single passage designed to illustrate the danger, to which the king himself would be exposed, if he should persevere in his present course. "Cæsar," said he, "had his Brutus; Charles the First, his Cromwell; and George the Third"—here he paused, as if hesitating what to say; but it seemed so obvious, that he was about to intimate, that George the Third, too, might look out for a violent death, that the cry of "Treason, Treason," was set up by the members who were opposed to him. Henry, without manifesting the least embarrassment, but rising in still greater majesty, from the effort that was made to put him down, fastened his piercing eye upon the Speaker of the House, whose profligacy in the management of the public treasury, he had just before had occasion to expose, and added, with inimitable emphasis, as the closing words of the sentence—"may profit by their example." After another of his expressive pauses, and as a comment

upon the outrage, by which he had been interrupted, he subjoined, with a power perfectly electric, "If this be treason, make the most of it."

It would be easy to occupy, not merely a single hour, but several hours, in describing Henry's wonderful efforts of eloquence, as they were scattered along through his whole public life; but, for this, I must refer to his biography by Wirt; and I do it with the more alacrity, as it is not only one of the most instructive, but one of the most eloquent and fascinating works of the kind in the language. I trust, however, that enough has been said, to show that he was a very prince among orators. What Whitefield was in the pulpit, he was at the bar and in the senate house; with this difference, however, that *his* mind was incomparably more profound and penetrating. Whitefield's sermons, which, in the delivery, completely entranced his hearers, and caused them to look upon him as an almost unearthly personage, when they came from the press, even after having been subjected to his own correction, seem comparatively jejune and imbecile; and, we are left to infer, the wonderful power of the manner, from the wonderful lack of power in the matter. But not so with Henry. His manner was, indeed, the very highest type of public speaking; but it was *what* he uttered, not less than *how* he uttered it, that decided the character of his oratory. It is, of course, but an imperfect report of any of his speeches, that has come down to us; but imperfect, as it is, we can see a grandeur of conception, a grasp of intellect, an ability to grapple with giants, and to pierce the distant future, that have scarcely belonged to any other man. I have heard it suggested, that possibly he might have profited in respect to public speaking, by the opportunities he enjoyed in early life, of frequently listening to the celebrated President Davies, who resided in Henry's immediate neighborhood, and who is generally acknowledged to have been the first American pulpit orator of his day. But, however, this may have been, there is much reason to believe, that Henry himself had much to do, in forming the character of another pulpit orator, who is justly regarded as among Virginia's most illustrious sons—I mean Dr. Waddell—the blind clergyman, whom the biographer of Henry has done so much to immortalize in the *British Spy*. That man in his youth, often heard Henry speak; and though he was as far as possi-

ble from being an imitator, there is little doubt, that he insensibly imbibed from him some of those qualities, particularly that marvelous simplicity, in which the power of both Henry and Waddell seemed well nigh to be concentrated. Great credit is due to Wirt, for having contributed so much to illustrate the character of the Virginia orator; but, it may reasonably be doubted, whether any thing that ever has been, or ever will be written, concerning him, even approaches the idea of what he was, as it lies in the minds of those who have grown up on the immediate theatre of his fame, and amidst the traditions of his greatness.

There is one more aspect, in which we must view Patrick Henry, else we shall not only have a very incomplete view of his character, but shall have omitted that, in which his chief glory consisted—I mean, we must contemplate him as a *patriot*; for, if he had a ruling passion, it was his devotion to the interests of his country. To this, his ingenuity, his eloquence, his wonderful insight into the future, every gift that heaven had bestowed upon him, was rendered subservient. The history of his patriotism, would be the history of his whole public career; and the utmost that I can attempt in this hasty sketch, is to present before you, the most general synopsis of those public relations and acts, through which his patriotism displayed itself.

The love of liberty seems to have been deeply inwrought among the elements of his moral nature; and hence, we find, that he was among the first—some will have it, the very first—to conceive the idea of resistance to the arbitrary policy of the mother country. Certain it is, that while the multitude were thinking only of submission, and while even the brighter and bolder spirits were projecting only such measures of relief, as should consist with a continued subjection to the crown, the views of this immortal patriot reached farther: in his bosom had already sprung up the hope, that we should, ere long, be an independent people; and, that hope at no distant period, became a settled conviction: and, that conviction awoke all the enthusiasm of his soul, and nerved him for resolute and unceasing action. It is related of him, that in an incipient stage of the controversy, and before the thought of a permanent separation between the two countries had been broached, he was inquired of, by one of his friends, whether

he believed, that Great Britain would drive her colonies to extremities; and, if she should, what he thought would be the issue of the war. After looking around to see who were present, he expressed himself confidentially to the company, in the following manner: "She will drive us to extremities—no accommodation will take place—hostilities will *soon* commence; and a desperate and bloody touch it will be." "But," said his friend, "do you think, that an infant nation, as we are, without discipline, arms, ammunition, ships of war, or money to procure them,—do you think it possible, thus circumstanced, to oppose successfully the fleets and armies of Great Britain?" "I will be candid with you," replied Henry. "I doubt whether we shall be able *alone*, to cope with so powerful a nation." "But," continued he, rising from his chair with great animation, "where is France—where is Spain—where is Holland—the natural enemies of Great Britain! Where will they be all this while! Do you suppose that they will stand by, idle and indifferent spectators of the contest? Will Louis XVI, be asleep all this time? Believe me, No! When he shall become satisfied, by our serious opposition, and our declaration of independence, that all prospect of reconciliation is gone, then, and not till then, will he furnish us with arms, ammunition and clothing, and not with these only; but he will send his fleets and armies to fight our battles for us; he will form for us a treaty offensive and defensive, against our unnatural mother. Spain and Holland will join the confederation; our independence will be established, and we shall take our place among the nations of the earth." It is stated, that when he uttered the word *Independence*, the company seemed startled; as they had never heard anything of the kind before even suggested.

I have already had occasion in speaking of Henry as an orator, to notice the fact, that as early as 1764, he was elected a member of the Legislature of Virginia, and, as such, distinguished himself, by his inflexible opposition to British tyranny, and his incipient movements towards independence. He held this office by repeated re-election till 1774, when, in consequence of the enactment of the Boston Port Bill, or a bill by which the British government withdrew from the town of Boston, its privileges as a port of entry, the first general Congress was assembled at Philadelphia, and he was appointed one of the delegates to represent his native State. Early in the next year

(1775), we find him an active member of the Virginia Convention, and greatly in advance of the rest of the members in respect to the strength of the measures, which the exigency required; and just before the close of the session, he introduced resolutions in favor of immediate preparation for the military defence of the colony. The resolutions met with a vigorous opposition from most of the leading members of the Convention, on the ground, that the measure contemplated was premature; but, Henry's overpowering speech, which is regarded as among his highest efforts of eloquence, prevailed to the passage of the resolutions; and a committee was appointed, of which Henry and Washington were members, to prepare and report a plan for the organization of the militia.

At this point, we find Henry suddenly standing forth in a new character—that of a military man; and, such was the genius and prowess that he discovered, that if circumstances had not withdrawn him, soon after, from this kind of life, it is not improbable, that he might have figured among the most brilliant commanders of his time. As the indications of an ultimate resort to arms became more decisive, the Governors of the several Colonies resolved on an attempt to gain possession of the military stores, at the various points at which they had been collected. In accordance with this determination, Lord Dunmore, then Governor of Virginia, caused about twenty barrels of powder to be conveyed by night from the magazine at Williamsburg, to an armed schooner, then lying in James river. The matter produced great excitement in the neighborhood the next morning; but, the Governor, when applied to by the municipal authorities, made some explanation, which so far satisfied them, that, for a time, the public tranquility was restored. In the county of Hanover, however, where Henry had fixed his residence, the voice of complaint was not so easily hushed; and, at a meeting of the inhabitants of that county, at which he was present, and made a most eloquent and exciting address, it was decided to march at once to Williamsburg, and either obtain payment for the powder, or compel the Governor to its restitution. A company of volunteers headed by Henry, forthwith proceeded on the expedition; and, the result was, that the king's Receiver General, gave a bill for the value of the property. The Governor immediately fortified his palace, and issued a proclamation, declaring Henry and his

co-adjutors guilty of a treasonable movement. But the voice of the whole surrounding country was raised in his favor; and meetings were held, applauding his conduct, and expressing a determination to protect him, at all hazards. There was, however, no attempt made to molest him; and, shortly after his return home, he proceeded to Philadelphia, to take his seat in Congress. With this session of Congress, closed his immediate connection with national politics; for, a series of events now occurred, which called for his service in a different capacity, and kept him, during the rest of his life, almost entirely within the limits of his native State.

The Governor, having, in consequence of some fresh demonstration of patriotic feeling in the city, withdrawn with his family, to reside on board a sloop of war, there was another meeting of the Virginia Convention, summoned by the House of Burgesses, to meet at Richmond, on the 24th of July. This body, assuming, that the Governor, by the course he had taken, had virtually abdicated his authority, proceeded to constitute a committee of safety, to represent in his absence, the executive branch of the government. A military organization of the Colony was, also, resolved upon, which provided, among other things, for the raising of two regiments of soldiers; and Henry was appointed not only Colonel of the first regiment, but Commander in Chief of all the forces that should be raised in Virginia. Considering his inexperience in military affairs, no higher compliment than this could have been paid to him; but the appointment seems to have given offence in certain quarters, and the result was, that after a series of events, which the time does not allow me to detail, and which occurred in a few months, he retired from military life altogether. He had evidently much reason to complain of injurious treatment in the matter; and a considerable portion of his soldiers resented so highly the injustice that had been done him, that they were just in the act of withdrawing from the service altogether; and it was only Henry's magnanimity in advising them, that finally determined them to remain. When it was known that he had tendered his resignation, the troops put on mourning, and presented to him an address, expressive of devoted attachment and boundless admiration.

As it devolved on the Colonies now to re-organize their political institutions on a new foundation, and as each Colo-



ny was regarded as having an inherent right to adopt any form of Government it might prefer, this right was exercised by means of popular conventions; and such a convention for Virginia, was held at Williamsburg on the 6th of May, 1776. Henry was a leading member of it, and was one of the committee that reported a declaration of rights and a plan of government, which were unanimously adopted. The new Constitution vested the executive power in a chief magistrate, with the title of Governor, to be annually elected by the Legislature, and to be eligible for three successive terms; and Henry was immediately designated to this office, the duties of which he discharged, of course, with the utmost ability and fidelity.

During the second year of Henry's administration, (for he was elected for three successive years,) occurred the memorable conspiracy against Washington, which involved many persons of distinction, both in Congress and in the army, and in which Gates and Conway are understood to have been the principal actors. It is impossible to enter into the details of this conspiracy, which, however, had no other effect upon the character of the Father of his country, than to surround it with additional glory; and I advert to it here, merely to say, that the part which Henry took in relation to it, was honorable alike to his patriotism and his friendship. An anonymous letter was addressed to him, designed to alienate his affections from Washington, and to enlist his influence to drive him from his post, as Commander in Chief of the army. Henry's clear mind instantly comprehended the nefarious design, and his noble spirit revolted at the idea of being invited to participate in it. He immediately enclosed the infamous letter to Washington, accompanied with an expression of regret, that there should be occasion to trouble him with so unworthy a communication, which, yet he did not feel himself at liberty to withhold; assuring him at the same time of the warm personal friendship which he felt for him, and his unabated confidence in both his ability and integrity.

As he became ineligible to the office of Governor, by the terms of the constitution, after three years, he was elected a member of the Assembly, where he continued to exercise a mighty influence to the close of his active life. One occasion, on which his eloquence was signally displayed, was the introduction of a resolution to permit those who had left the country during the Revolutionary

struggle, on account of their sympathy with the interests of Great Britain, to return to their old homes. This resolution was resisted with great eloquence, by some of the prominent members of the Assembly, particularly by Judge Tyler, father of the late President; and Henry was recklessly assailed, for his inconsistency, in having been so earnest in the cause of independence, and then so tolerant towards his country's enemies; but, he defended the resolution, not only on the principle of magnanimity, but from considerations of policy—maintaining, that population was what the country needed, and, that this was one of the most obvious ways of increasing it. His speech, on the occasion, which is said to have been one of his noblest efforts, availed to the passage of the resolution.

Passing over various measures of public utility, which were suggested by his wisdom, and carried by his eloquence, we find him, in 1786, elected one of the delegates of the convention for revising the articles of confederation among the States. This honorable commission, however, he felt himself constrained, from prudential and private considerations, to decline. But, when the result of this National Convention came to be submitted to the several States, he was elected a member of the Convention of Virginia, to decide upon the merits of the new Constitution; and, strange as it may seem, he stood forth with his matchless eloquence to oppose it. "He contended, that, changes were dangerous to liberty; that, the old confederation had carried us through the war, and secured our independence; and, that, it might easily be amended to meet any exigency; that the proposed government, was a consolidated government, in which the sovereignty of the States would be lost, and all pretensions to rights and privileges, would be rendered insecure; that, the want of a bill of rights, was an essential defect; that, general warrants should have been prohibited; and, that to adopt the Constitution with a view to subsequent amendments, was only submitting to tyranny, in the hope of being, at some future time, liberated from it. He then offered a resolution, containing a bill of rights and amendments for the greater security of liberty and property, to be referred to the other States, before the ratification of the proposed form of government." Though he defended his views with the most fervid eloquence, and apparently, with a full conviction,

that the very existence of our national freedom depended on their being practically carried out, yet, there was an amount of influence on the other side, that prevailed against the passage of his resolution. His bill of rights and amendments, however, were afterwards accepted, and directed to be transmitted to the other States; and, some of these amendments, have been incorporated into the Federal Constitution. This was, perhaps, the only signal defeat, which Henry ever encountered during his whole public life; and, though some have questioned the purity of the motives, which dictated his course, there is every reason to believe, that he acted from deliberate and honest conviction. And, one of the best proofs of it, that he could have given, was, that he subsequently acquiesced in the Constitution, and gave it his earnest and active support. In an address, to the people, not long before his death, in connection with his offering himself as a candidate for the House of Delegates, he has this memorable passage: "The State has quitted the sphere in which she has been placed by the Constitution. What authority has the county of Charlotte, to dispute obedience to the laws of Virginia? And is not Virginia to the Union, what the county of Charlotte is to *her*? Opposition on the part of Virginia, to the acts of the Federal Government, *must* beget their enforcement by military power. This will produce civil war; civil war, foreign alliances; and, foreign alliances, must end in subjugation to the powers called in. Pause and consider. Rush not, I conjure you, into a condition, from which there is no retreat. You can never exchange the present government, but for a monarchy. If the administration have done wrong, let us all go wrong together, rather than to split into factions, which must destroy that *union* on which our existence hangs." What the departed patriot spake to the men of his time, he now repeats from his grave, to the men of our day; and wo, wo be to those, who refuse to hear and heed his admonitions!

If time allotted, I should delight to present this great man, in some other aspects; and, especially, to show how he advanced his more private relations. I should be obliged to admit, indeed, that as he was an heir to humanity, so he was not without its infirmities; but, I could still, with truth, present him as a fine example of whatever is lovely, and of good report in the intercourse of life. I

could show, from well authenticated facts, that he had a heart that beat quick to the tale of injustice, or oppression, or sorrow; that, he looked upon slavery as a curse, and deprecated the prospect of its continuance; that, he regarded Christianity, with the utmost reverence, and cheerfully contributed to sustain its institutions; and, looked to it, as his only refuge, when his flesh and heart were failing. I might dwell, too, upon the dignified cheerfulness, which he exhibited in the decline of life, and show how, even after bodily infirmities had clustered upon him, he was the life of every circle; how his company was coveted, even by little children, who admired his pleasantries, before they were able to appreciate his greatness. But, these, and various other points in his character, I must leave, and hasten this already too protracted train of remarks to a close.

But, I cannot close, without asking you to consider the design of Providence, in occasionally bringing forward such a noble specimen of human nature, as we have now been contemplating. Patrick Henry is now by universal consent, ranked among the giants of the race; there is a lustre about his name, that will, in all probability, endure, as long as the sun shines to rule the day. He had his particular mission; and, we can now see what it was—it was a mission of patriotism—a mission of good will to his country; and, in fulfilling it, he became pre-eminently one of his country's deliverers. Let us keep him in veneration for that, and teach our children to do so, after we are gone. But, let us profit by what he was, and what he did in another way—by viewing him as an illustrious specimen of man. It is from such examples, that we learn most effectually, the dignity of our nature. If, in this infancy of his existence, he was capable of such mighty efforts, what must be the strength of his faculties, what the measure of his intellectual greatness, in that higher state of being, on which he has now entered! True, he stood almost by himself; and, yet, there is not an individual, so insignificant, or obscure, but that he shares the same nature, and possesses, though in an inferior degree, the very same faculties with that illustrious man. Think as meanly and as penitently as thou wilt, of thine own perversion of the constitution which God has given thee; but, remember, that as it comes from His hands, it is a glorious constitution; and, what thou hast to do, is to cul-

tivate diligently, not only thine intellectual, but moral faculties, with a view to their more complete and everlasting development on the theatre of immortality.

Let me say, too, the glance which we have taken at the character and services of this wonderful man, ought to endear to us, the liberty and the institutions of our country. Henry's mind was only one of a host of illustrious minds, that produced the glorious result of our independence. We sit under our own vine, unmolested; but, the planting, and the rearing of this vine, cost sacrifices of which we do not dream—it was a work, that kept in requisition for years, minds and hearts, that constituted the brightest galaxy of the age; and, now the wisdom and valor of those great patriots and heroes still lingers, as an all pervading element in our noble institutions. Let us habituate ourselves to a consciousness of their presence, as if they were watching with earnest solicitude, over the goodly fabric which their hands have reared. Let us venerate their greatness; let us cherish their memories; let us embalm their fame—otherwise, we are not worthy to breathe this free air; to tread this earth, redeemed by blood, from the curse of tyranny. My country, I trust in God, that a glorious destiny awaits thee. I think I see thee, in the vista of ages, looming up into a nobler object than the sun now shines upon; but, believe me, thou wilt never realize this destiny, if thou shouldst be guilty of forgetting thy deliverers. But thou wilt not forget them; thou wilt associate them with everything that is great, with everything that is dear. Thy children's children, to the latest generation, shall study their history, till it becomes as a household word; shall reverence and imitate their virtues, and lay bright garlands upon their graves.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*The Office and Work of the Christian Ministry.* By James M. Hoppin, Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in Yale College. New York: Sheldon & Co. The volume discusses the subject of Preaching—its History and Art; the Analysis of a Sermon;

Rhetoric, in its general principles, applied to Preaching—Invention and Style : and the Pastoral Office—in itself considered; the Pastor as a Man—in his Relations to Society, to the Church, in connection with Public Worship and the Care of Souls. The author recognizes intellectual qualifications, but he does not forget that the first requisite in the ambassador, is, that he must love Christ, and then those for whom Christ died, that he must be wholly consecrated to the work and present the Gospel in its fulness and purity. The work, is the ripe fruit of many years study. The suggestions and discussions are presented with great clearness and order, and although we may not regard some things in the light in which he does, writing from a Congregational stand-point, the book is a useful and valuable contribution to the literature of the subject.

*Notes, Critical and Explanatory on the Acts of the Apostles.* By Melancthon W. Jacobus, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Western Theological Seminary of Allegheny, Pa. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. We have been long familiar with the labors of Dr. Jacobus, as an expositor of the Scriptures, and the results of his investigation on this important Book detract nothing from his well-earned reputation in this direction.

*History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence.* By Henry C. Fish, D. D. Two volumes in one. New York: M. W. Dodd. We are glad to see a new edition of this work, originally published in 1856, but for some time out of print. Here are found the master-pieces of Pulpit eloquence, selected from such writers as Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, Barrow, Hall, Chalmers, Edwards, Davies, Mason and others, with discourses from Chrysostom, Augustine, Wickliffe, Knox, Latimer and other eminent divines. Some of which are in this work, for the first time presented in an English dress. In connection with the German Pulpit, are given illustrations of Luther, Melancthon, Spener, Zollikoffer, Herder, Reinhard, Schleiermacher, Harms and Theremin. Accompanying these selections are historical sketches of preaching in the different countries represented, and biographical and critical notices of the several preachers and their discourses.

*Lamps, Pitchers and Trumpets, Lectures on the Vocation of the Preacher.* Illustrated by Anecdotes, Biographical, Historical, and Elucidatory, of every order of Pulpit Eloquence, from the Great Preachers of all Ages. New York: M. W. Dodd. This volume is composed of Lectures, delivered at Mr. Spurgeon's College for young men with the ministry in view, and is not intended to be a systematic treatise, but a range over a wide field in connection with the subject of preaching. The title is taken from the narrative of Gideon, who divided his three hundred men into three companies, putting a trumpet in every man's right hand and a pitcher in the other, and a lamp within the pitcher ; so "words" says the author, are "lamps, pitchers and trumpets," as a lamp giving light to the intellect, as a trumpet, arousing the conscience from its slumber, and as a pitcher bearing refreshment to the heart. The book contains many interesting things, well told.

*Son of Man.* Discourses on the Humanity of Jesus Christ. By Frank Coulin, D. D. Minister of the Notional Church of Geneva. Translated with the sanction of the Author. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. These discourses, (1) Jesus of Nazareth ;

(2) The Holy One and Just; (3) The man of Sorrows; (4) The Risen One; (5) The King; (6) The Teaching of Jesus Christ—are well translated. They are popular in style, evangelical in spirit, and present old subjects in a new phase.

*The Old Testament History.* From the Creation to the Return of the Jews from Captivity. Edited by William Smith, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. This work meets a long felt want, which seems to leave nothing in its way to be desired. The matter is full, thorough and erudite, and presented in clear, condensed and elegant language. In addition to the Old Testament History with notes, references and citations, the volume furnishes an account of each of the Books of the Bible, the geography of the Holy Land and related countries, with the political and ecclesiastical antiquities of the Jews.

*A Commentary on the Confession of Faith.* With Questions for Theological Students and Bible Classes. By A. A. Hodge, D. D. Professor in the Western Theological Seminary of Allegheny, Pa. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Extraordinary care and much labor are evinced in the preparation of this Commentary, and it must prove of great value to theological students and ministers of the Gospel, in the study of the Confession of Faith. It consists of an exhaustive analysis of the great Standard of the Presbyterian Church, with Scriptural proofs and illustrations, accompanied with a series of questions for the convenience of teachers and pupils.

*The Christian Worker.* A call to the Laity. By Rev. Charles F. Beach. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. This work has been written in sympathy with earnest effort among all God's people, for the conversion of the world, the ministry itself being regarded by the author as inadequate to the work. The discussion embraces the following points: (1) The Gospel of Christ, a Dispensation of Mercy to the World; (2) Every Disciple of Christ, a Preacher of His Gospel; (3) The Necessity of Lay Preaching; (4) The Preparation for the Work; (5) The Manner of Performing it; (6) Incentives to Faithfulness in the Discharge of the Duty; (7) The Time to Commence the Work; (8) The Reward of Fidelity.

*Remarkable Facts:* Illustrative and Confirmatory of Different Portions of Holy Scripture. By Rev. J. Leifchild, D. D. With a Preface by his Son. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. The design of the work, is to elucidate Scripture by the facts of human experience. It abounds in interesting incident and graphic narrative, and its perusal will be productive of benefit.

*The Life of Samuel Miller, D. D., LL. D.* Second Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton, N. J. By Samuel Miller. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. This record of the long, useful and honored career of an eminent divine, in the Presbyterian Church, will be welcomed and read with interest, not only by the members of his own denomination, but by Christians of every name. He was a good man, faithful in the discharge of his varied duties, laborious and untiring in his efforts to do good, and, by all who were brought into relations, was regarded with great reverence and love. The volumes are replete with information, and furnish a history of the times in the Presbyterian Church for more than half a century.



*Dr. Martin Luther's House Postil*, or Sermons on the Gospels for the Sundays and Principal Festivals of the Church Year. Translated from the German. Vol. I. Columbus, O. Schulze & Gassman. This is a most valuable contribution to our ecclesiastical literature, and its appearance should be regarded with interest not only by the Lutheran Church, but by Christians of every name. It is proper, that the earnest truths, uttered in his own dwelling, by the gifted Reformer, which, in the original, have cheered and strengthened so many hearts, should be given to the public in an English form. Since the days of Paul no man ever expounded God's word with so much simplicity and power. He speaks with force and fidelity. He is always natural and impressive. Although it is difficult to reproduce Luther's peculiar style, the translators, Prof. E. Schmid and Rev. D. M. Martens, have been remarkably successful in their work. We trust that the work will meet with such encouragement, that the publication of the other volumes, necessary to complete the series, will not be delayed.

*Life and Deeds of Dr. Martin Luther*, By Rev. Hermann Fick. Translated from the German by Rev. M. Loy. Columbus, O. J. A. Schulze. The prominent events in the Life of the Great Reformer are here presented in a connected and condensed form, in a manner adapted to interest and instruct the young. The translation by Professor Loy is idiomatic and graceful.

*The Doctrine of Justification*. By Rev. M. Loy, A. M. Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary at Columbus, O. Columbus: J. A. Schulze. This is a full and able discussion of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, highly creditable to the author. It is presented with great earnestness, and in plain, lucid and vigorous language. However much some may differ from the writer on a few points, all will admire the ability and excellent spirit, with which the discussion is conducted.

*Questions on the Gospels for the Church Year*. By E. Greenwald, D. D. Vol. I. Lancaster, Pa. School Association of the Church of the Holy Trinity. This is a good Question Book. It goes thoroughly into the examination of every lesson and brings out its leading points. It cannot fail to render service to those, for whom it is specially designed.

*Chips from a German Workshop*. By Max Muller, M. A. In Two Volumes, New York: Charles Scribner & Co. This is an admirable work by a man of patient study, profound research and varied attainments. It is an attractive and valuable English periodical. The first volume consists of essays on the Science of Religion. Religion is regarded as the deepest interest of humanity, and the study of the world's religion as offering one of the most important fields for studying the history of the human race. The second volume gives discussions on Mythology, Traditions and Customs. We differ from the author in some of his views on the doctrines, practices and religious institutions of India and China, and think that he sometimes rationalizes too much, yet no one can read the volumes without delight and instruction.

*Women's Suffrage; The Reform against Nature*. By Horace Bushnell. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. This book is worthy of thoughtful examination. The discussion is able, comprehensive and thorough, and ought to settle the question in the minds of intel-

ligent Christians. The fundamental theory of the author is, that the nature of the one sex is complementary to the other, and that those who would obliterate these natural distinctions would mar the charms of life, and destroy the religious sanctities of home. He takes hold of this great social problem and discusses it with great vigor, clearly showing the fallacies which underlie the arguments of those who would extend to woman the elective franchise, and fully demonstrating that the reform, which they seek, is opposed to her own nature and the manifest ordination of God.

*Bible Wonders.* By Rev. Richard Newton, D.D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. Dr. Newton is one of our most successful instructors of the young on religious subjects. In the present volume texts of Scripture are aptly selected and skillfully illustrated by incidents and anecdotes of ancient and modern history, and by the discoveries of the Microscope and Telescope.

*Little Effie's Home.* By the author of "Donald Frazier," etc. New York: Carter & Brothers. Our friend Peter Carter is doing good service by his simple, natural stories, so excellent in their illustration of Bible truth, and written in the interest of the youthful reader. Little Effie's curious sayings will aid him in the clearer comprehension of the life and work of the twelve disciples.

*American Edition of Dr. Wm. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.* Revised and Edited by Professor H. B. Hackett, D.D. With the co-operation of Ezra Abbott, LL.D. New York: Hurd & Houghton. This valuable edition of Dr. Smith's Dictionary, so often commended in our *Quarterly*, has reached Part XIX, which concludes with an elaborate article on the New Testament.

*The English Version of the New Testament and the Marginal Readings.* By Charles F. Schaeffer, D.D. Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Phila. Andover: W. F. Draper. This is an able, elaborate and valuable production, indicating in its preparation great industry and laborious research on the part of the author, who gives an interesting history of the various translations of the Bible into English, and illustrates his subject by the selection and careful examination of the Epistle to the Romans.

*In Memoriam.* Death and Funeral Obsequies of Rev. W. V. Gotwald, late Pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church, Lancaster, Pa. Also a Sermon of Deceased, preached on the First Sunday of January, 1869. Published by the Church Council. Lancaster, Pa. Rauch & Cochran.

*The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.* By G. F. Krotel, D.D. Philadelphia Lutheran Book Store.

*The Decoration of the Soldiers' Graves, Preached in St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Easton, May 30th, 1869.* By Rev. J. H. Barclay, D.D. Easton, Pa. Wood and Bunsteen.

*Courageous Thankfulness.* Twentieth Pastoral Anniversary, July 14, 1869. St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C. J. Geo. Butler, D.D. Washington, D. C. Judd & Detweiler.

*Dr. Martin Luther's Church-Postil.* Sermons on the Epistles, Comprising a Sermon on the Epistles for the different Sundays and Festivals in the Year. Translated from the German. New Market, Va. Lutheran Publication Society.

